

# Soneni Xhow-or-venilol Soneni Xhow-or-venilol Ssena nisiloqonjelu holen Qeer-ocer

DOT/FHWA

Publication No: FHWA-PL-94-012 HPM-40/12-93 (500) P

Publication No. FHWA-PI-94-012 HPM-40/1-94 (10M) R

D	Numerical Listing		Alphabetical Listing		
Pro- file No.	Code	Metropolitan Area	file No.	Code	Metropolitan <b>Area</b>
1	NYC	New YorkNorthern New JerseyLong Island CMSA	12	ATL	Atlanta
2	LOS	Los AngelesAnaheimRiverside, CA CMSA	18	BAL	Baltimore
3	CHI	ChicagoGaryLake County, ILINWI CMSA	7	BOS	Boston
4	SFC	San FranciscoOaklandSan Jose, CA CMSA	33	BUF	Buffalo
5	PHI	PhiladelphiaWilmingtonTrenton, PANJDEMD CMSA	34	CHA	Charlotte
6	DET	DetroitAnn Arbor, MI CMSA	3	CHI	Chicago
7	BOS	BostonLawrenceSalem, MANH CMSA	23	CIN	Cincinatti
8	WAS	Washington, DCMDVA MSA	13	CLE	Cleveland
9	DAL	DallasFort Worth, TX CMSA	29	COL	Columbus
10	HOU	HoustonGalvestonBrazoria, TX CMSA	9	DAL	Dallas
11	MIA	MiamiFort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	22	DEN	Denver
12	ATL	Atlanta, GA MSA	6	DET	Detroit
13	CLE	ClevelandAkron-Lorain, OH CMSA	36	HAR	Hartford
14	SEA	SeattleTacoma, WA CMSA	10	HOU	Houston
15	SDG	San Diego, CA MSA	31	IND	Indianapolis
16	MIN	Minneapolis Paul, MNWI MSA	25	KSC	Kansas City
17	STL	St. Louis, MOIL MSA	2	LOS	Los Angeles
18	BAL	Baltimore, MD MSA	11	MIA	Miami
19	PIT	PittsburghBeaver Valley, PA CMSA	24	MIL	Milwaukee
20	PHX	Phoenix, AZ MSA	16	MIN	Minneapolis
21	TAM	TampaSt. PetersburgClearwater, FL MSA	32	NRL	New Orleans
22	DEN	DenverBoulder, CO CMSA	1	NYC	New York City
23	CIN	CincinnatiHamilton, OHKYIN CMSA	28	NFK	Norfolk
24	MIL	MilwaukeeRacine, WI CMSA	37	ORL	Orlando
25	KSC	Kansas City, MOKS MSA	5	PHI	Philadelphia
26	SAC	Sacramento, CA MSA	20	PHX	Phoenix
27	POR	PortlandVancouver, ORWA CMSA	19	PIT	Pittsburgh
28	NFK	NorfolkVirginia BeachNewport News, VA MSA	27	POR	Portland
29	COL	Columbus, OH MSA	35	PRO	Providence
30	SAT	San Antonio, TX MSA	39	ROC	Rochester
31	IND	Indianapolis, IN MSA	26	SAC	Sacramento
32	NRL	New Orleans, LA MSA	17	STL	St. Louis
33	BUF	BuffaloNiagara Falls, NY CMSA	38	SLC	Salt Lake City
34	CHA	CharlotteGastoniaRock Hill, NCSC MSA	30	SAT	San Antonio
35	PRO	ProvidencePawtucketFall River, RIMA CMSA	15	SDG	San Diego
36	HAR	HartfordNew BritainMiddletown, CT CMSA	4	SFC	San Francisco
37	ORL	Orlando, FL MSA	14	SEA	Seattle
38	. SLC	Salt Lake CityOgden, UT MSA	21	TAM	Tampa
39	ROC	Rochester, NY MSA	8	WAS	Washington DC

Listing of Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants in 1990 (Listed numerically by population rank, and alphabetically)

### **REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161

#### Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of Information is estimated to average 1 hour per resonse, including the time for reviewing instructions; searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of Information, Including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for information Operations and Reports 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204 Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) 2. REPORT DATE 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED November 1993 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 5. FUNDING NUMBERS Journey to Work Trends in the United States and Its Major HW362 Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1990 6. AUTHOR(S) Michael A. Rossetti, Barbara S. Eversole 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Department of Transportation REPORT NUMBER Research and Special Programs Administration John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center Cambridge, MA 02142 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 10. SPONSORING/MONITORING U.S. Department of Transportation AGENCY REPORT NUMBER Federal Highway Administration Office of Highway Information Management Washington, DC 20590 **11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES** 12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE This document is available to the public through the National

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

This report identified the changes which have occurred from 1960 to 1990 in population and demographics, worker characteristics, means of travel to work, household vehicle availability, and geographic revisions in the United States and its large metropolitan areas. The report is based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census data from decennial data sets.

Selected Census Information for 1960. 1970, 1980 and 1990 was summarized from available Census data sets, and to a more limited extent from Census publications. Due to the thirty year time span, two levels of geography are used to present and analyze these data. In producing this report, evaluations were made of differences in selected data items over the Involved time period. The report summarizes these evaluations and presents the resultants data in a series of tables, figures, metropolitan statistical profiles and maps.

Chapter 1 of the report contains background information, technical details about the data and geographic conventions that were used In the analysis. Chapter 2 presents national summary information for journey-to-work trends over the thirty year period. Chapter 3 looks at demographic characteristics in large metropolitan areas. Chapter 4 considers the characteristics of the work trip, worker residences and places of work, commuter flows and travel times within large metropolitan areas. Chapter 5 examines the means of transportation used by metropolitan area workers. Chapter 6 looks at trends in households, vehicle ownership and availability. Chapter 7 identifies how these data are affected by the latest geographic revision, showing what has occurred since 1990. The Profiles provide detailed statistical information, and maps for the U.S. as a whole, and for each of the 39 metropolitan areas that formed the core of this study.

14. SUBJECT TERMS	15. NUMBER OF PAGES 245			
Transportation statistics			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

### JOURNEY-TO-WORK TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS, 19604990

U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center Cambridge, MA

#### **Prepared** for

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Office of Highway Information Management Washington, D.C.

#### **FINAL REPORT**

#### PREFACE/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was supported by a project plan agreement between the Federal Highway Administration, Office of Highway Information Management, and the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center.

We thank the following individuals who offered guidance, support and special services during the course of the project: Alan Pisarski, James J. McDonnell, Matthew Rabkin, and Jeffrey Turner. We also thank the Journey to Work and Migration Branch of the Bureau of the Census. Special appreciation goes to Anne McEwan who provided exceptional editorial and production support during the final draft.



#### NOTICE

۰.,

'ł

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thirty Year Trends, 1960-1990	ES-1
Population and Workers	ES-1
Commuting	ES-2
Household Vehicles	ES-2
Ten Year Trends, 1980-1990	ES-3
Population and Workers	ES-3
Commuting	ES-3
Household Vehicles	ES-3
Geographic Revisions in Metropolitan Areas	ES-4

#### **CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION**

An Overview.	l-1
Background.	1-1
Guide to Using the Report	1-2
Cautions on Using Data in the Tables	1-2
Report Organization	1-4
Sources of Data	1-5
Limitations and Accuracy of the Data	1-5
Geography Considerations	1-5
Definition of Metropolitan Area	1-5
Revisions to Geographic Boundaries	l-6
New England	1-7
Data Definitions.	1-7
Urban and Rural	1-7
Household	1-7
Income of Households and Median Income	1-9
Vehicles Available	1-9
Employment Status	1-9
Place of Work l	l-10
Means of Transportation	1-12
Private Vehicle Occupancy	l- 12
Time Leaving Home to Go to Work	1-13
Travel Time to Work	1-13

#### **CHAPTER 2. NATIONAL SUMMARY**

Commuting Indicators.	2-1
Thirty Year Trends	2-1
Ten Year Trends	2-4

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)**

Household Formations	2-7
Urban Populations	2-7
Growth in the Number of Workers	2-7
Workers per Household	2 <b>-</b> 11
Density Indicators	2-11
Choice of Mode to Work.	2-13
Driving Alone	2-13
Carpooling	2-13
Public Transit	2-13
Walking to Work	2-15
Working at Home	2-15
Travel Time.	2-15
Time Leaving Home	2-15
Total Vehicles and Vehicles Per Household.	2-16
Zero Vehicle Households	2-16
One Vehicle Households	2-17
Two Vehicle Households	2-17
Three or More Vehicle Households	2-17

#### CHAPTER 3. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Population: Areawide, Central County, and	
Suburban County	3-1
Comparative Growth Rates in Central	
Counties and Suburban Counties	3-1
Household Formation and Size	3-8
Urban Populations	3-8
Household Income	3-14

#### CHAPTER 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK TRIP: WORKER RESIDENCES, PLACES OF WORK, COMMUTER FLOWS, AND TRAVEL TIMES

Characteristics of Workers	4-1
Growth in the Number of Workers	4-1
The Rise in Workers to Total Population	4-2
The Male/Female Distribution of Workers	4-2
Workers per Household and Workers per Family 4	-12
Workers by Place of Residence and Place of Work 4	-14
Workers Living in Central Counties 4	-15
Workers Living in Suburban Counties 4	-20
Jobs to Workers in Central Counties 4	-20

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)**

Commuter Flows and Travel Times	4-20
Intracounty and Intercounty Commuting Trends	4-20
Commuting Flows	4-25
Travel Time	4-36
Time Leaving Home to Go to Work	4-36

#### **CHAPTER 5. MEANS OF JOURNEY TO WORK**

The Use of Privately Owned Vehicles for Commuting	5-1
Commuting Shares Accounted for by Privately Owned Vehicles	5-1
Privately Owned Vehicles – Drivers, Passengers and Occupancy Rates 5	5-4
Individual Modal Trends	5-4
Driving Alone	5-4
Carpooling	-14
Public Transit (Bus and Rail) 5-	-14
Working at Home	-21
Bicycling and Walking to Work 5-	-25

#### CHAPTER 6. VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AND AVAILABILITY

Trends in Household Vehicle Ownership	6-l
Average Number of Vehicles per Household	6-7
Zero Vehicle Households	6-7
One Vehicle Households	6-7
Two Vehicle Households	6-7
Three or More Vehicle Households	6-9

#### **CHAPTER 7. SELECTED CHANGES BASED ON 1992 GEOGRAPHIC REDEFINITION**

Geographic Boundary Changes	7-1
Changes in Total Areawide Population and Population Density	7-1
Changes in Total Areawide Workers	7-5
Changes in Total Areawide Vehicle Populations	7-5
Changes in Land Area	7-5

#### PROFILES. U.S. AND METROPOLITAN AREA MAPS AND STATISTICAL PROFILES

National Summary Statistics	P-5
New York-Northern New Jersey- Long Island, NY-NJ CMSA	P-7
Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside, CA CMSA	P-9

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)**

	Chicago-Gary-LakeCounty,IL-IN-WICMSA	P-11
	San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	P-13
	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	P-15
	Detroit-Ann Arbor, MI CMSA	P-17
	Boston-Lawrence-Salem, MA-NH CMSA	P-19
	Washington, DC-MD-VA MSA	P-21
	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	P-23
	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	P-25
	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	P-27
	Atlanta, GA MSA	P29
	Cleveland- Akron-Lorain, OH CMSA	P-31
	Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA	P-33
	San Diego, CA MSA	P-35
	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	P-37
	St. Louis, MO-IL MSA	P-39
	Baltimore, MD MSA	P-41
	Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA CMSA	P-43
	Phoenix, AZ MSA	P-45
	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	P-47
	Denver-Boulder, CO CMSA	P-49
	Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH-KY-IN CMSA	P-5 1
	Milwaukee-Racine, WI CMSA	P-53
	Kansas City, MO-KS MSA	P-55
	Sacramento, CA MSA	P-57
	Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	P-59
	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA MSA	P-61
	Columbus, OH MSA	P-63
	San Antonio, TX MSA	P-65
	Indianapolis, IN MSA	P-67
	New Orleans, LA MSA	P-69
	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY CMSA	P-71
	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC MSA	P-73
	Providence-Pawtucket-Fall River, RI-MA CMSA	P-75
	Hartford-New Britain-Middletown, CT CMSA	P-77
	Orlando, FL MSA	P-79
	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT CMSA	P-81
	Rochester, NY MSA	P-83
	DIV A Charges in MCA/OMCA Charges I + 1074 1002	
APPEN	DIA A. Unanges in MSA/UMSA County List, 19/4-1983	• A-I

APPENDIX B. List of all Counties in Metropolitan Areas – 1983 Geography.....B-l

## LIST OF TABLES

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### **CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION**

1-1	Listing of Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants in 1990	
	(Listed numerically by population rank, and alphabetically)	1-3
1-2	Effect of 1983 OMB Revisions on Geographies of 1990	
	Metropolitan Areas with Over One Million Inhabitants	1-8

#### **CHAPTER 2. NATIONAL SUMMARY**

2-1	Journey-to-Work Comparisons, National Totals, 1960-1990	. 2-2
2-2	National Trends 1960-1990 Factors, U.S. Totals Compared to	
	Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants,	. 2-3
2-3	Ten Year Trends in Journey-to-Work Factors, U.S. Totals Compared to	
	Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants	
	(based on 1983 geography)	. 2-5
2-4	Journey-to-Work Profile: National Summary Statistics 1990	. 2-6
2-5	Selected Demographic and Commuting Comparisons, U.S. and Large	
	Metropolitan Areas, 1990	2-7
2-6	Indicators, Trends, and Factsheet for Journey-to-Work	
	Patterns, 1980-1990	2-8
2-7	Journey to Work, 1990, Maximums and Minimums by State	. 2-9
2-8	Journey to Work, 1990, Maximums and Minimums by Metropolitan Area	2-10
2-9	Labor Force Participation Rates by Sex, Percentages, 1960-1990	2-11
2-10	Departure Times to Work, U.S. and Metropolitan Area Comparisons, 1990	2-15

#### **CHAPTER 3. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

3-1	Population (Areawide, Central and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980	3-2
3-1A	Population (Areawide, Central and Suburban Counties) 1980-1990	3-4
3-2	Fastest and Slowest Growing Metropolitan Areas, Percent	
	Changes by Decade	3-5
3-3	Fastest Growing Suburban Counties in Large	
	U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1980 and 1980- 1990	3-5
3-4	Central County Population, 1960-1990	3-9
3-5	Relationship of Central County to Areawide Population, 1980-1990	3-11
3-6	Demographic Ratios and Urban/Rural Population Percentages, 1990	3-15
3-7	Median Household Income and Percent of Households in Income Intervals,	
	Thirty-Nine Metropolitan Areas, 1990	3-16

## LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

## CHAPTER 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK TRIP: WORKER RESIDENCES, PLACES OF WORK, COMMUTER FLOWS AND TRAVEL TIMES

4-1	Worker Comparisons, U.S. and Thirty-Nine Metropolitan Areas, 1990	. 4-1
4-2	Workers by Place of Residence	
	(Areawide, Central, and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980	4-4
4-2A	Workers by Place of Residence	
	(Areawide, Central, and Suburban Counties) 1980-1990	4-7
4-3	Workers As a Percent of Population, 1960-1980	4-8
4-3A	Workers As a Percent of Population, 1980-1990	4-9
4-4	Workers by Gender, 1960-1980	4-10
4-4A	Workers by Gender, 1980-1990	4-11
4-5	Workers per Household, 1980 and 1990, for Large Metropolitan Areas	4-14
4-6	Workers by County of Residence, Large Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1990	4-15
4-7	Central County Workers, 1960-1990	4-17
4-8	Place of Work, Workers Living in Central Counties, 1980	4-18
4-8A	Place of Work, Workers Living in Central Counties, 1990	4-19
4-9	Place of Work, Workers Living in Suburban Counties, 1980	4-23
4-9A	Place of Work, Workers Living in Suburban Counties, 1990	4-24
4-10	Workers Living & Working in the Same County, 1960-1980	4-29
4-10A	Workers Living & Working in the Same County, 1980-1990	4-30
4-11	Workers Living & Working in Different Counties, 1960-1980	4-31
4-11A	Workers Living & Working in Different Counties, 1980-1990	4-32
4-12	Journey-to-Work Flows, Share of Commuters, 1980 and 1990	4-34
4-13	Journey-to-Work Flows, Mean Travel Times and	
	Percent Changes, 1980 and 1990	4-38
4-14	Travel Time Intervals to Work, Percent Distribution	
	(in minutes), 1990	4-39
4-15	Departure Time Intervals for Work Trips, U.S. and Large	
	Metropolitan Areas, Percentage Distributions, 1990	4-40
4-16	Time Leaving Home to Go to Work, 1990	4-41

#### **CHAPTER 5. MEANS OF JOURNEY TO WORK**

5-1	Workers Use of Privately Owned Vehicles, 1960-1980	. 5-2
5-1A	Workers Use of Privately Owned Vehicles, 1980-1990	. 5-3
5-2	Workers Travel by Privately Owned Vehicles, Percent Change Between 1960-1980	5-5
5-2A	Workers Travel by Privately Owned Vehicles, Percent Change Between 1980-1990	5-6
5-3	Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, 1970-1980	. 5-7
5-3A	Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, 1980-1990	. 5-8
5-4	Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, Central and Suburban Counties, 1990	. 5-9
5-5	Privately Owned Vehicle Drivers and Passengers,	
	Percent Change Between 1980-1990	5-10

## LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

5-6	Journey to Work by Mode, 1980	5-11
5-6A	Journey to Work by Mode, 1990	5-12
5-7	Journey-to-Work Mode Share, 1990	5-13
5-8	Journey to Work by Vehicle Pools, 1990	5-16
5-9	Journey to Work by Bus, Percent Change Between 1960-1980	5-19
5-9A	Journey to Work by Public Transit, Percent Change Between 1980-1990	5-20

#### CHAPTER 6. VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AND AVAILABILITY

6-l	Households by Vehicle Availability, 1980-1990	6-2
6-2	Households by Vehicle Availability, Percent Change 1960- 1980	6-5
6-2A	Households by Vehicle Availability, Percent Change 1980-1990	6-6

#### CHAPTER 7. SELECTED CHANGES BASED ON 1992 GEOGRAPHIC REDEFINITION

Changes in Metropolitan Areas as a Result of the 1992 OMB Revision	7-2
1990 Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-3
1990 Worker Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-4
1990 Workers as a Percent of Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-6
1990 Vehicle Availability, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-8
1990 Land Area (in Square Miles), 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-10
1990 Vehicle Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-11
1990 Population Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-12
1990 Worker Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-13
1990 Vehicle Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition	7-14
	Changes in Metropolitan Areas as a Result of the 1992 OMB Revision

#### PROFILES. U.S. AND METROPOLITAN AREA MAPS AND STATISTICAL PROFILES

P-1 Listing of Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants in 1990 ..... P-2

### **LIST OF FIGURES**

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

ES-1	Total Population and Full-Time Workers 1960 and 1990	ES-1
ES-2	Total Workers by Sex 1960 and 1990	ES-1
ES-3	Total Worker Commutes by Mode 1960 and 1990	ES-2
ES-4	Total Households by Number of Household Vehicles, 1960 and 1990	ES-2
ES-5	Effect of Geographic Revision on Total Population of Metropolitan Areas	ES-4

#### **CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION**

1-1	Effect of Geographic Revisions on Suburban Population, Thirty-Nine	
	Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1990	-8

#### **CHAPTER 2. NATIONAL SUMMARY**

2-1	Selected Density Indicators, 1990 – 39 Metropolitan Areas	2-12
2-2	Means of Journey to Work, 1990 – National and Metropolitan Area Totals	2-14

#### **CHAPTER 3. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

Central County Comparisons, 1990 — Percent Areawide Population & Land	3-7
Effect of 1983 Geographic Revision on Area Population	3-6
Changes in Central County Population, 1960-1990	3-10
Central County Share of Area Population – Percent Change 1980-1990	3-12
1990 Household Ratios	3-13
	Central County Comparisons, 1990 — Percent Areawide Population & Land Effect of 1983 Geographic Revision on Area Population Changes in Central County Population, 1960-1990 Central County Share of Area Population — Percent Change 1980-1990 1990 Household Ratios

#### CHAPTER4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK TRIP: WORKER RESIDENCES, PLACES OF WORK, COMMUTER FLOWS, AND TRAVEL TIMES

4-1	Percent Workers to Total Population, 1960-1990	4-3
4-2	Male/Female Worker Ratios, 1960-1990	4-6
4-3	Workers Per Family – Percentage Distributions (1989 Data)	4-13
4-4	Workers Residing in Central County - Work Location - 1990	4-16
4-5	Workers Residing in Suburban Counties Work Location – 1990	4-21
4-6	Central County Jobs to Workers, 1990	4-22
4-7	Workers Living & Working in Same County - Percent Change 1960-1990	4-26
4-8	Workers Living & Working in Different Counties – Percent Change 1960-1990	4-27
4-9	Commuter Flows - Percent Distribution, 1990	4-28
4-10	Mean Travel Time to Work, 1980 and 1990	4-37

## LIST OF FIGURES (Cont.)

#### CHAPTER 5. MEANS OF JOURNEY TO WORK

5-1	Drive Alone vs. Vehicle Pool Trips - Percent of All Work Trips, 1990	5-15
5-2	Vehicle Pools in Commuting, 1990 – Percent of All Private Vehicle Trips	5-18
5-3	Commuting by Bus/Streetcar to Work - Percent Change 1980-1990	5-22
5-4	Commuting by Bus/Streetcar to Work - Percent Change 1960-1990	5-23
5-5	Commuting by Rail or Subway to Work - Percent Change, 1960-1990	5-24
5-6	Work at Home, 1980-1990 - Number of Workers and Percent Change	5-26
5-7	Walk and Bike to Work, 1990 - Percent Distribution	5-27

#### CHAPTER 6. VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AND AVAILABILITY

6-l	Total Vehicles and Population - Percent Change, 1980- 1990
6-2	Vehicles Per Square Mile, 1990 6-4
6-3	Zero Vehicle Households, 1980-1990 - Percent Change,
	Central and Suburban County
6-4	Three+ Vehicle Households, 1980-1990 – Percent Change,
	Central and Suburban County , ,



#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

How people in the United States travel to work is affected by demographic and worker characteristics, the availability of alternative modes of commuting, perceived travel time and the supply and location of jobs. This report explores commuting behavior on both a national and a metropolitan area basis from data drawn from the U.S. Decennial Census. Topics covered in the report include: population characteristics, characteristics of workers, mode choice for the commute trip and vehicle ownership and availability, and the effect on the data of geographic revisions. The thirty year trends from 1960-1990 are observed, as well as the more recent trends over the ten years from 1980-1990. Two levels of analysis are presented. First, national level trends are looked at, followed by an analysis of trends in large metropolitan areas.

#### Thirty Year Trends, 1960-1990

**Population and Workers.** Over the thirty year period from 1960-1990 the U.S. population increased 39% from 179 million to 249 million, and the number of households increased 73% from 53 million in 1960 to 92 million in 1990. During this same period, however, household size decreased from 3.35 persons per household to 2.63 persons per household.

The number of workers from 1960-1990 increased 78%, from about 65 million to 115 million (Figure ES-I). This increase in the number of workers is almost twice the rate of population growth. Much of the increase can be attributed to increasing numbers of women in the workforce. In 1960, women comprised only 32.3% of the workforce, but by 1990 this number had jumped to 45.3% (Figure ES-2). Also of note is that the percent of workers with jobs outside their county of residence increased 200% between 1960 and 1990, while the percent of central county commutes declined.

Metropolitan areas with populations over one million increased from thirty-four areas in 1960 to thirty-nine areas in 1990. Population within these metropolitan areas increased much more than the





Figure ES-2. Total Workers by Sex 1960 and 1990



national figures, growing from 77 million people in 1960 to 124 million people in 1990, a 60% increase. By definition, population is much more dense in the metropolitan areas than in the U.S. as a whole, with 664 persons per square mile in the former and only 70 persons per square mile in the latter. A decrease in household size, much the same as the national decrease, resulted in persons per household dropping from 3.24 in 1960 to 2.65 in 1990.

In the thirty-nine metropolitan areas the number of workers increased at a faster rate than nationally. The figures more than doubled from 29 million workers in 1960 to almost 60 million workers in 1990. Each successive decade from 1960 onward produced a 22% average annual growth rate from 1960-1990. Nationally in 1990, there were 33 workers per square mile, while in the metropolitan areas there were 320 workers per square mile. The number of women in the workforce in the metropolitan areas increased almost identically to the national figures, from 33.6% to 45.6%.

Commuting. Private vehicle trips increased consistently as more people began to drive alone to work. From 1960-1990, total workers increased by 78%, while workers

commuting by private vehicle rose from 43 million in 1960 to 101 million in 1990, or about 135.5%. By 1990, workers commuting by private vehicle accounted for 88% of all commute trips (Figure ES-3). Transit decreased from 7.8 million in 1960 to 5.9 million in 1990 as more and more people began to drive alone to work. Departure times were spread over many hours, with most workers departing between 7:00 A.M. and 829 A.M. An important external factor affecting commuting behavior is increasing suburbanization of the United States. Those workers whose jobs were located outside their counties





of residence rose from 9 million in 1960 to 27.5 million in 1990, a gain of 206%, the fastest rising segment of work commuters.

In almost every instance from 1960-1990, private vehicles captured increasingly larger shares of all metropolitan area work trips. Indeed, private vehicle trips increased from 61% of all commute trips in 1960 to 83% in 1990. In fourteen of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas private vehicles accounted for over 90% of total 1990 commute trips. Also in 1990, transit ridership in metropolitan areas was 9%, while only 5.3% nationally.

**Household Vehicles.** Household vehicle growth was very strong, almost tripling from 54.8 million in 1960 to 152.4 million in 1990. In 1960, the average household had only one vehicle, but that figure rose to 1.66 by 1990 as multiple vehicle -households became the majority. Similarly, the number of households with three or more vehicles increased to 17% of all households or nearly 16 million in 1990, up from only 1.3 million in 1960, becoming the fastest growing of all household types. Almost all the growth in vehicles has occurred in households with two or more vehicles. These growth patterns are illustrated in Figure ES-4. Additional factors affecting household ownership of vehicles include the increase in average -vehicle age and the advent of smaller, more fuel efficient

Figure ES4 Total Households by Number of Household Vehicles, 1960 and 1990



automobiles. From 1960-1990 vehicles per household in the metropolitan areas increased from 1.0 to 1.59, while vehicles per person increased from 0.3 1 to 0.58. Overall, suburban counties had higher growth rates in vehicles per household than central counties.

#### Ten Year Trends, 1980-1990

**Population and Workers.** In the ten years from 1980-1990 the U.S. population increased 9.8%, from 227 million people to 248 million people and the number of households increased 14% from 80 million to 92 million. Persons per household, continuing the trend from 1960 onward, declined 4.4% from 2.75 to 2.63. The number of workers increased 19%, from 97 million to 115 million. Workers per household in contrast, increased less than 5%, from 1.22 to 1.25. The comparatively small increase in workers per household is explained by the dramatic tandem drop in household size. Workers who worked in their county of residence increased 25% from 1980-1990, while workers who worked outside their county of residence increased almost 50%.

The population increased slightly faster in metropolitan areas than in the U.S. as a whole, from 111 million in 1980 to 124 million in 1990. Persons per household in the thirty-nine metropolitan areas in 1990 ranged from a high of 3.04 in Salt Lake City to a low of 2.32 in Tampa. The number of workers in the metropolitan areas also rose slightly faster than the number of workers nationally, from 46 million in 1980 to 59.7 million in 1990. The number of workers per household rose from 1.18 in 1980 to 1.31 in 1980 to 59.7 million in 1990. The number of workers per household rose from 1.18 in 1980 to 1.31 in 1990. Again, like the national numbers listed above, this increase appears much less static in light of decreasing household size. From 1980-1990, among the metropolitan areas, the maximum number of workers per household was 1.52 in Washington, D.C., while the minimum was in Tampa with 1.05. The maximum number of workers as a percent of population was in Washington, D.C. with 56.4%, while the minimum was in New Orleans with 41.5%.

Commuting. In 1980, 64% of all commuters drove alone to work; by 1990 the drive alone share had increased to 73%. This increase in the rate of driving alone substantially affected other joumey-to-work modes. Transit use, for example, fell from 6.2% to 5.1% from 1980-1990. The share of people walking to work decreased from 5.4 million in 1980 to 4.5 million in 1990. Additionally, the percentage of persons using carpools declined 32%. Time spent commuting has increased slowly from 2 1.7 minutes in 1980 to 22.4 minutes in 1990.

Much of the gain in numbers of people driving alone from 1980 to 1990 came at the expense of car-pooling, and to a lesser degree, transit. Transit declined from 6.22% in 1980 to 5.12% in 1990. Working at home showed an increase from 2.2 million in 1980 to 3.4 million in 1990. However, over the thirty years from 1960-1990 working at home experienced an overall 27% loss in share of commute modes. Central county to central county and suburban county to same suburban county commute trips composed the majority of trips for the metropolitan areas in 1990. In 1990, workers in metropolitan areas averaged 25.2 minutes commuting to their jobs.

**Household Vehicles.** The dramatic rise in vehicles per household mentioned above halted and from 1980-1990 the number of vehicles per household grew only 5%, from 1.61 in 1980 to 1.66 in 1990. Vehicles per worker declined a small amount from 1.34 to 1.32. Between 1980 and 1990 zero vehicle households, as a percentage of all households, declined by 11% while households with three or more vehicles remained constant.

The unprecedented growth in the number of vehicles per household that occurred between 1960-1980 slowed (much like the figures for the U.S. as a whole) from 1.52 in 1980 to 1.59 in 1990. From 1980-1990 seventeen central counties had declines in zero vehicle households and thirty counties experienced growth in three or more vehicle households. In 1990, Tampa and Sacramento, at 1.45 vehicles per worker, tied for the maximum number, while New York City had the minimum with 0.93 vehicles per worker.

#### **Geographic Revisions in Metropolitan Areas**

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) periodically revises the geographic boundaries of metropolitan areas, thus affecting data comparisons for Census journey-to-work data. Figure ES-5 shows the effect of the 1983 revision on total population in large metropolitan areas. The net effect was to increase area population counts. As a result of the revision, population in metropolitan areas changed in 1980 from 102 million to 110.7 million. The bulk of this Report includes tables using the 1974 and 1983 OMB definitions. In 1992, OMB again updated the definition of metropolitan areas. The effect of this was a general expansion in the land area of the thirtynine metropolitan areas. Chapter 7 includes tables comparing figures using the 1983 and 1992 OMB The expansion affects the demographic definitions. characteristics of the land area in two ways. First,





population in the metropolitan areas increased slightly. Second, population density declined as larger, less populated counties were added to the boundaries of the metropolitan areas.

#### **Chapter 1**

#### INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 provides an overview and reviews the background of this report. It addresses issues of geographic revision, the sources and definitions of data, and the limitations of the data. Guidance is provided on using and interpreting the data tables found in the report. The organization of the report is then outlined and discussed.

#### An Overview

This report documents the changes that occurred nationwide between 1960 and 1990 in joumey-towork demographic characteristics, geographic flows, mode of travel to work, vehicle availability, and other related indicators of commuting activity by U.S. workers.<sup>1</sup> Thirty years ago, most commuter tips were traditional, home-to-work, suburb-to-central city trips. A journey to work in 1990 is more likely to include side trips for day care, for convenience shopping, or some other purpose aside from getting to or from work. It is also more likely to occur entirely within suburban counties. In this report, particular emphasis is placed on the 1980-1990 period, where rapidly changing socioeconomic factors may help to explain various trends that occurred.

Most of the data used in this report are from the 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File (STF) 3, and earlier editions of the Census of Population and Housing.

In the chapters that follow, more detailed information is provided for each of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas having over one million residents as reported in the 1990 Census and defined by the Office of Management and Budget. The general structure is to report information at three levels: 1) metropolitan areawide data, 2) central county data, and 3) suburban county data. By subject area, the report looks at population and households, worker characteristics, places of work and residence, worker flows and travel times, mode of travel, and vehicle availability.

#### Background

In 1986, the FHWA published the report **Journey-to-Work Trends Based on 1960, 1970, and 1980 Decennial Censuses**<sup>2</sup> (from now on called the Trends report). The report was prepared for use by policy makers, program managers, and researchers in the analysis of the highway and transportation system. The design and content of the report were guided by a special task force of the TRB Committee on Data Collection and Information Systems. Material in the FHWA report was the basis of the highly regarded **Commuting in America**<sup>3</sup> report.

The present report updates and expands upon an earlier report: Briggs, D., Pisarski, A. and McDonnell, J. "Journey-to-Work-Trends Based on 1960, 1970 and 1980 Decennial Censuses" (U.S. DOT/FHWA, July 1986).

<sup>2</sup> Briggs, D., Pisarski, A. and McDonnell, J. "Journey-to-Work Trends Based on the 1960, 1970 and 1980 Decennial Censuses" (U.S. DOT/FHWA. July 1986).

<sup>3</sup> Pisarski, A. "Commuting in America" (Eno Foundation, 1987)

A DOT Working Group on Journey to Work was established in 1992 to guide the writing of the present report. The objective of this report was to update and expand the information in the Trends report. The Trends report covered thirty-four metropolitan areas. Due to changes in population, the list of new areas has grown to thirty-nine areas, encompassing six additions and one deletion (Dayton/Springfield).<sup>4</sup> Table 1-1 lists the thirty-nine metropolitan areas included in this report. The profile numbers match 1990 population ranks while the codes reference the graphs used in this report.

#### **Guide to Using the Report**

**Cautions on Using Data in the Tables.** The tables in chapters two through six depict the U.S. and its thirty-nine metropolitan areas with over one million inhabitants in 1990. At the bottom of each table, totals are provided. Because there are occasional missing entries for metropolitan areas, readers should exercise caution when comparing the totals. This is especially so when comparing entries from the 1960-1980 and 1980-1990 periods, because the geography and metropolitan areas both change across the periods. Table P-1 in the Profiles section presents national level totals for many data items, and readers may wish to refer to these when making specific metropolitan area comparisons. Other details to bear in mind include:

- Metropolitan Areas: In comparing data from 1960-1980 with data from 1990, readers should note that the two groups of metropolitan areas over one million are not in direct correspondence. The 1960-1980 group contains thirty-four areas, while the 1980-1990 group has thirty-nine areas.
- **Totals:** Column totals reflect only metropolitan areas for which data were obtainable for all years represented on the table. Totals are provided only for the convenience of readers, and do not necessarily suggest all activity for metropolitan areas over one million. Missing data should be noted before using totals.
- **Percent Changes:** All totals for percent changes reflect only those metropolitan areas for which data were obtainable. Thus, any missing observations were first excluded from calculations.

Metropolitan Area

Central County

Norfolk, VA	Norfolk City, VA
Charlotte NC/SC	Mecklenberg County, NC
Hartford, CT	Hartford City, CT
Orlando, FL	Orange County, FL
Salt Lake City, UT	Salt Lake County, UT
Rochester, NY	Monroe County, NY

<sup>4</sup> Six new metropolitan areas were added in 1990. These areas and their central counties are:

	Numerical Listing		Alphabetical Listing		
Pro- file No.	Metropolitan Code Area	Pro- file No.	Metropolitan Code Area		
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	NYC New YorkNorthern New JerseyLong Island CMSA LOS Los AngelesAnaheimRiverside, CA CMSA CHI ChicagoGaryLake County, ILINWI CMSA SFC San FranciscoOaklandSan Jose, CA CMSA PHI PhiladelphiaWilmingtonTrenton, PANJDEMD CMSA DET DetroitAnn Arbor, MI CMSA BOS BostonLawrenceSalem, MANH CMSA WAS Washington, DCMDVA MSA DAL DallasFort Worth, TX CMSA HOU HoustonGalvestonBrazoria, TX CMSA MIA MiamiFort Lauderdale, FL CMSA ATL Atlanta, GA MSA CLE ClevelandAkronLorain, OH CMSA SEA SeattleTacoma, WA CMSA SDG San Diego, CA MSA MIN MinneapolisSt. Paul, MNWI MSA STL St. Louis, MOIL MSA BAL Baltimore, MD MSA PIT PittsburghBeaver Valley, PA CMSA PMX Phoenix, AZ MSA TAM TampaSt. PetersburgClearwater, FL MSA DEN DenverBoulder, CO CMSA CIN CincinnatiHamilton, OHKYIN CMSA MIL MilwaukeeRacine, WI CMSA SAC Sacramento, CA MSA POR PortlandVancouver, ORWA CMSA NFK NorfolkVirginia BeachNewport News, VA MSA COL Columbus, OH MSA NFL NorfolkVinginia BeachNewport News, VA MSA COL Columbus, OH MSA NFL New Orleans, LA MSA NRL New Orleans, LA MSA NRL New Orleans, LA MSA NRL New Orleans, LA MSA BUF BuffaloNiagara Falls, NY CMSA CHA CharlotteGastonia-Rock Hill, NCSC MSA POR PortlandNew BritainMiddletown, CT CMSA ORL Orlando, FL MSA	12 18 7 33 34 3 23 13 29 9 22 6 36 10 31 25 2 11 24 16 32 1 28 37 5 20 19 27 35 39 26 17 38 30 15 4 14	ATL Atlanta BAL. Baltimore BOS Boston BUF Buffalo CHA Charlotte CHI Chicago CIN Cincinnati CLE Cleveland COL Columbus DAL Dallas DEN Denver DET Detroit HAR Hartford HOU Houston IND Indianapolis KSC Kansas City LOS Los Angeles MIA Miami MIL Milwaukee MIN Minneapolis NRL New Orleans NYC New York NFK Norfolk ORL Orlando PHI Philadelphia PHX Phoenix PIT Pittsburgh POR Portland PRO Providence ROC Rochester SAC Sacramento STL St. Louis SLC Salt Lake City SAT San Antonio SDG San Diego SFC San Francisco SEA Seattle		
39	ROC Rochester, NY MSA	8	WAS Washington DC		

## Table 1-1. Listing of Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants in 1990(Listed numerically by population rank, and alphabetically)

**Report Organization.** The report provides information for each of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas having over one million residents as defined by the 1990 Census figures. The general structure is to report information at three levels: 1) metropolitan areawide data, 2) central county data, and 3) suburban county data. In terms of broad themes, the report looks at population and households, worker characteristics, places of work and residence, worker flows and travel times, mode of travel, and vehicle availability.

**Chapter** 2 documents **national changes** that occurred between 1960 and 1990 in journey-to-work demographic characteristics, geographic flows, mode of travel to work, vehicle availability, and other related indicators of commuting activity by U.S. workers. Particular emphasis is placed on the years from 1980-1990, a decade of rapidly changing socioeconomic factors.

**Chapter 3** describes **population characteristics** within the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, including trends for central and suburban counties. The effects of central county size and land area are assessed, along with such items as household formation and size, household income, and urban and rural residence. Some principal themes that emerge from the analysis include declining household size, rapid population growth in Sunbelt areas, and population growth in suburban areas.

**Chapter 4** describes *characteristics of the work trip.* The chapter includes discussion and tables on residential and workplace location based on central/suburban county definitions and the effect of commuting flows and travel times. Also included is new data on time leaving home to go to work.

**Chapter 5** includes tables on **mode choice for the commute trip.** Drive alone trips were foremost over the past 30 years, while losses occurred in public transit, carpooling and even walking. There was some growth in the number of people who work at home. Some factors contributing to mode choice include increases in multipurpose trips, the increase in women in the labor force, and the adoption of flexible work hours by some companies.

**Chapter** 6 addresses household **vehicle ownership and availability**, including vehicles per person and vehicles available per worker. Nearly 80 million vehicles were located within the thirty-nine metropolitan areas comprising the study group. Over the thirty-year period, vehicles per household grew 60%, while vehicles per worker increased by over 50%.

**Chapter** 7 documents the changes in *geographic redefinition* of the metropolitan areas. In late 1992, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget revised the geography of many metropolitan areas discussed in this report. This chapter illustrates how the new geographic boundaries affect some population, worker, and vehicle characteristics described in earlier chapters of the report.

The **Profiles** section includes a **map** showing the geography, county boundaries, and central cities of each metropolitan area. Also provided are a one-page **statistical profile** sheet of 1990 data for each metropolitan area and a profile of U.S. totals. Readers can obtain local commuting and demographic statistics from these profiles. Most of the data in these profiles are replicated in the topically defined tables in the preceding chapters.

The Appendices provide details on *additions and deletions of counties* that have resulted from geographic revisions.

#### **Sources of Data**

The Census Bureau distributes data from the 1990 Census of Population and Housing in a series of Summary Tape Files (STF's). There are four STF series at various levels of geographic detail. In preparing this report, the STF 3A series was used. It includes sample data weighted to represent the total population. In addition, the file contains loo-percent counts and unweighted sample counts. It contains characteristics similar in content to the 1980 STF, but with expanded detail. The STF 3A provides data for states and their sub-areas in hierarchical sequence down to the block-group level. These include county, county subdivision, place (or place part), census tract/block numbering area (or part), and block group (or part).

Information was extracted from CD-ROMs and loaded onto a database manager and spreadsheet software programs. When required, data for earlier years were obtained directly from the Census Bureau or from publications commonly available in libraries, such as the Census of Population and Housing (CPH-L-80) data set.

**Limitations and Accuracy of the Data.** Because the geographic scale of analysis is limited to counties in this report, we cannot fully explore suburban development, reverse commuting, and suburbto-suburb commuting. The county level analysis in this report does show major increases in commuting from the central county to suburban counties, and major increases in suburban county to suburban county. Because the objective of this report was to update the county level commuting flows presented in the earlier Trends report, movements of workers within counties, or along specific high density corridors within counties are beyond the scope of this analysis.<sup>5</sup> Also, for each metropolitan area, its central county and suburban counties often make up much different proportions of total land area. All data should be evaluated in this light.

The 1990 census data reported in STF 3A are based on a sample and are therefore subject to both sampling and nonsampling errors. Sampling error in data arises from the selection of persons and housing units to be included in the sample. Nonsampling error affects both sample and loo-percent data, and is introduced as a result of errors that may occur during the collection and processing phases of the census.

Each housing unit in the country received one of two versions of the census questionnaire: 1) a short-form that contained certain basic demographic and housing questions (loo-percent questions), and 2) a long-form that contained the loo-percent items and a number of additional questions. For the long-form, the primary sampling unit for the 1990 census was the housing unit, including all occupants. Three sampling rates were employed. Rural areas (fewer than 2,500 persons) were sampled at a rate of 1-in-2. Urban areas were sampled at a rate of 1-in-8 All other areas were sampled at a rate of 1-in-6. When all sampling rates were taken into account across the U.S., approximately 1-in-6 housing units were included in the 1990 census sample.

#### **Geography Considerations**

**Definition of Metropolitan Area.** The general concept of a metropolitan area (MA) is a large population nucleus surrounded by adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social

<sup>5</sup> For more detailed information at the local level, readers can consult the Census Transportation Planning Packages (CTPP) published by the Census Bureau, or other STF data series.

integration with that nucleus. Some MA's are defined around two or more nuclei. Each MA must contain either a place with at least 50,000 inhabitants or an urbanized area and a total population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). An MA may also include one or more outlying counties that have close economic and social relationships with the central county. An outlying county must have a specified level of commuting to the central counties and also must meet certain standards regarding metropolitan character, such as population density, urban population, and population growth. In New England, MA's are composed of cities and towns rather than whole counties.

If an area has more than one million inhabitants and meets certain other requirements specified in the Metropolitan Area standards published in the *Federal Register*,<sup>6</sup> it is termed a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA), consisting of two or more major components recognized as Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA's). Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA's) are relatively freestanding MA's and are not closely associated with other MA's, These areas typically are surrounded by nonmetropolitan areas. The OMB defines MA's in terms of entire counties, except in the six New England states where they are defined in terms of cities and towns. The set of areas known as MSA's, PMSA's, and CMSA's are collectively designated MA's In this report, there are 19 CMSA's and 20 MSA'S.<sup>7</sup>

**Revisions to Geographic Boundaries.** The MSA/CMSA boundaries in the Trends report were based on the 1974 Census boundary definitions. The 1990 Decennial Census uses the updated 1983 Census boundary definitions. A DOT Working Group on Journey to Work decided to adopt the new boundary definitions and work backward to revise the 1980 data to conform with the new definitions. Readers should note that in all the tables and figures presented in this report, the data for New York City do not include the New England portion of the CMSA (i.e., Fairfield County, Connecticut). Table 1-2 below indicates the effect of geography revisions on specific metropolitan areas. The boundaries of ten metropolitan areas remained unchanged. In twenty-three metropolitan areas the geography increased. Six areas actually decreased in size as a result of the revision process.

For 1980 data, the geographic boundaries used in the earlier Trends report were adjusted to updates based on the new geography. Counties that were either added or removed from the thirty-nine MSA' s/CMSA' s were identified. Due to the way in which data were collected, it was not possible to adjust data from 1960 or 1970 using the new boundaries.' The DOT Working Group preferred to continue using the central county as a unit of analysis. Analysis based on the unit of central city was considered, but ultimately considered unsatisfactory for this report.' The Working Group also decided to limit the scope to metropolitan areas with over one million inhabitants.

<sup>6</sup>FR (12154-12160), March 30, 1990.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Two terms that were used in the 1980 Census are no longer being used. These are the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), and the Standard Consolidated Statistical Area (SCSA).

<sup>8</sup> Data for many counties that had been added to the definitions of metropolitan areas over the years were not covered in the necessary detail previous to their inclusion in the new boundaries.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> In each MSA and CMSA, the largest place and, in some cases, additional places are designated as central cities. A few PMSA's do not have central cities. The largest central city, and in some cases, up to two additional central cities are included in the title of the MA; there are also central cities that are not included in an MA title. An MA central city does not include any part of that city that extends outside the MA boundary.

Two sets of trends are presented in the tables in the following chapters: 1) the 1974 OMB geographic definitions are used to show data comparisons for 1960, 1970, and 1980; and 2) the 1983 OMB definitions are used to compare data for 1980 and 1990. Thus, there will be two observations for 1980 data; existing 1980 data are revised using the 1983 definitions, but not 1970 or 1960. Figure 1-1 illustrates how the change in geography affects the 1980 count of suburban population in the thirty-nine metropolitan areas. In presenting the tables, tables using the 1983 OMB definition for 1980 data have an "A" in the table number suffix. Tables using the 1974 OMB definition for 1980 data do not have an "A"

**New England.** As in the Trends report, the New England portion will continue to be excluded from the New York CMSA. The Boston and Providence metropolitan areas were excluded from the 1960 and 1970 data sets. These exclusions will continue, except for most 1980 and 1990 tabulations. Hartford is new to the list, and only 1980 and 1990 data will be presented, due to the grouping of data by cities and towns rather than counties. The NECMA<sup>10</sup> definition is employed to include the New England areas in particular analyses.

#### **Data Definitions**

**Urban and Rural.** The Census Bureau defines "urban" for the 1990 census as comprising all territory, population, and housing units in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more persons outside urbanized areas. More specifically, "urban" consists of territory, persons, and housing units in: 1) Places of 2,500 or more persons incorporated as cities, villages, boroughs (except in New York), and towns (except in the six New England states, New York, and Wisconsin), but excluding the rural portions of "extended cities"; 2) Census designated places of 2,500 or persons; 3) Other territory, incorporated or unincorporated, included in urbanized areas. Territory, population, and housing units not classified as urban constitute "rural." The urban and rural classification cuts across the other hierarchies; for example, there is generally both urban and rural territory within both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas.

To improve its measure of urban territory, population, and housing units, the Census Bureau adopted the concept of the urbanized area and delineated boundaries for unincorporated places (now, census designated places) for the 1950 census. This "urban" definition has remained basically unchanged since then.

**Household.** A household includes all the persons who occupy a housing unit. A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated persons who share living arrangements. In loo-percent tabulations, the count of households or householders always equals the count of occupied housing units. In sample tabulations, the numbers may differ as a result of the weighting process.

<sup>10</sup> Readers should take note that in computing some of the data series for New England metropolitan areas (Boston, Providence, and Hartford), the New England County Metropolitan Area (NECMA) definition is used to delineate county boundaries. This was necessary to maintain consistency with other parts of the U.S., since in New England metropolitan areas are defined by cities and towns, and hence leading to only partial county coverage (rather than the complete county coverage that NECMA's provide).

Geography	Geography	Geography	New Areas
Unchanged	Increased	Decreased	in 1990
Los Angeles Houston Miami Cleveland Seattle San Diego Phoenix Milwaukee San Antonio Buffalo	New York Chicago San Francisco Philadelphia Detroit Boston Washington Minneapolis St. Louis Baltimore Pittsburgh Tampa Kansas City Sacramento Portland Columbus New Orleans	Dallas Atlanta Denver Cincinnati Indianapolis Providence	Norfolk Charlotte Hartford Orlando Salt Lake City Rochester

## Table I-2. Effect of 1983 OMB Revisions on Geographies of 1990 Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants

Figure I-I. Effect of Geographic Revisions on Suburban Population, Thirty-Nine Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1990



Persons per household is a measure obtained by dividing the number of persons in households by the number of households. In cases where persons in households are cross-classified by race or Hispanic origin, the race or Hispanic origin of the householder is used rather than the race or Hispanic origin of each individual.

**Income of Households and Median Income.** Includes the income of the householder and all other persons 15 years old and over in the household, whether related to the householder or not. Because many households consist of only one person, average household income is usually less than family income.

The median divides the income distribution into two equal parts, one having incomes above the median and the other having incomes below the median. For households and families, the median income is based on the distribution of the total number of units including those with no income. The median for persons is based on persons with income. The median income values for all households, families, and persons are computed on the basis of more detailed income intervals than shown in most tabulations. Median household or family income figures of \$50,000 or less are calculated using linear interpolation. For persons, corresponding median values of \$40,000 or less are also computed using linear interpolation.

**Vehicles Available.** The data on vehicles available were obtained from questionnaire item H13, which was asked at occupied housing units on a sample basis. These data show the number of households with a specified number of passenger cars, vans, and pickup or panel trucks of one-ton capacity or less kept at home and available for the use of household members. Vehicles rented or leased for one month or more, company vehicles, and police and government vehicles are included if kept at home and used for non-business purposes. Dismantled or immobile vehicles are excluded. Vehicles kept at home but used only for business purposes also are excluded. Vehicles per household is computed by dividing aggregate vehicles available by the number of occupied housing units.

**Limitations.** 1980 census evaluations showed that the number of automobiles were slightly overreported, the number of vans and trucks slightly underreported. The statistics do not measure the number of vehicles privately owned or the number of households owning vehicles. Data on automobiles available were collected from 1960 to 1980. In 1980, a separate question also was asked on the number of trucks and vans. The data on automobiles and trucks and vans were presented separately and also as a combined vehicles available tabulation. The 1990 data are comparable to the 1980 vehicles available tabulations.

**Employment Status.** The data on employment status were derived from answers to questionnaire items 21, 25, and 26, which were asked of a sample of persons. The series of questions on employment status was asked of all persons 15 years old and over and was designed to identify, in this sequence: (1) persons who worked at any time during the reference week; (2) persons who did not work during the reference week but who had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent (excluding layoff); (3) persons on layoff; and (4) persons who did not work during the reference week, but who were looking for work the last four weeks and were available for work during the reference week.

The employment status data shown in this and other 1990 census tabulations relate to persons 16 years old and over. Some tabulations showing employment status, however, include persons 15 years old. By definition, these persons are classified as "Not in Labor Force." In the 1940, 1950, and 1960 censuses, employment status data were presented for persons 14 years old and over. The change in the universe was made in 1970 to agree with the official measurement of the labor force as revised in January 1967

by the U.S. Department of Labor. The 1970 census was the last to show employment data for persons 14 and 15 years old.

Employed persons are defined as all civilians 16 years old and over who were either (1) "at work" – those who did any work at all during the reference week as paid employees, worked in their own business or profession, worked on their own farm 15 hours or more as unpaid workers on a family farm or in a family business; or (2) were "with a job but not at work" – those who did not work during the reference week but had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent due to illness, bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, or other personal reasons. Excluded from the employed are persons whose only activity consisted of work around the house or unpaid volunteer work for religious, charitable, and similar organizations; also excluded are persons on active duty in the United States Armed Forces.

Limitations. The census may understate the number of employed persons because persons who have irregular, casual, or unstructured jobs sometimes report themselves as not working. The number of employed persons "at work" is probably overstated in the census (and conversely, the number of employed "with a job, but not at work" is understated) because some persons on vacation or sick leave erroneously reported themselves as working. This problem has no effect on the total number of employed persons. Since persons can change their employment status from one week to another, the lack of a uniform reference week may mean that the employment data do not reflect the reality of the unemployment situation of any given week.

**Place of Work.** The data on place of work were derived from answers to questionnaire item 22, which was asked of persons who indicated in question 21 that they worked at some time during the reference week. Data were tabulated for workers 16 years and over; that is, members of the Armed Forces and civilians who were at work during the reference week. Data on place of work refer to the geographic location at which workers carried out their occupational activities during the reference week. The exact address (number and street) of the place of work was asked, as well as the place (city or town, or post office); whether or not the place of work was inside or outside the limits of that city or town; and the county, State, and Zip code. If the person's employer operated in more than one location, the exact address of the location or branch where the respondent worked was requested. When the number and street name were unknown, a description of the location, such as the building name or nearest street or intersection, was entered.

Persons who worked at more than one location during the reference week were asked to report the one at which they worked the greatest number of hours. Persons who regularly worked in several locations each day during the reference week were requested to give the address at which they began work each day. For cases in which daily work did not begin at a central place each day, the person was asked to provide as much information as possible to describe the area in which he or she worked most during the reference week.

In some tabulations, place-of-work locations may be defined as "in area of residence" and "outside area of residence." The area of residence may vary from table to table or even within a table. For example, in a table that provides data for counties, "in area of residence" refers to persons who worked in the same county in which they lived, while "outside area of residence" refers to persons whose workplace is different from the one in which they lived. Similarly, in a table that provides data for several types of areas, such as the State and its individual metropolitan areas, counties, and places, theplace-of-work data will be variable and is determined by the geographic level (State, metropolitan area, county, or place) shown in each section of the tabulation.

In tabulations that present data for an MSA/PMSA, place-of-work locations are specified to show the main destinations of workers living in the MSA/PMSA. All place-of-work locations are identified with respect to the boundaries of the MSA/PMSA as "inside MSA/PMSA" or "outside MSA/PMSA." Locations within the MSA/PMSA are further divided into each central city, and each county or county balance. Selected large incorporated places also may be specified as places to work.

Within New England MSA/PMSA's the places of work presented generally are cities and towns. Locations outside MSA/PMSA's are specified if they are significant commuting destinations for residents of major MSA/PMSA's and their central cities, component counties, large incorporated places, or counties, cities, or other geographic area outside any metropolitan area. In tabulations for MSA/PMSA's in New England and certain other metropolitan areas, some place-of-work locations are identified as "areas" (e.g., Area 1, Area 5, Area 12, etc.). Such areas consist of groups of towns, cities, or counties that have been identified as unique place-of-work destinations. When an adjoining MSA/PMSA or MSA/PMSA remainder is specified as a place-of-work location, its components are not defined. However, the components are presented in the 1990 CP-1, General Population Characteristics for Metropolitan Areas and the 1990 CH-1, General Housing Characteristics for Metropolitan Areas reports. In tabulations that present data for census tracts outside metropolitan areas, place-of-work locations are defined as "in county of residence" and "outside county of residence."

Place-of-work data are given for selected minor civil divisions (generally, cities, towns, and townships) in the nine Northeastern States, based on the responses to the place-of-work question. Many towns and townships are regarded locally as the equivalent of a place and therefore, were reported a locality or incorporated place that formed a part of a township or town. The accuracy of the place-of-work data for minor civil divisions is greatest for the New England States. However, the data for some New England towns, for towns in New York, and for townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania may be affected by coding problems that resulted from the unfamiliarity of the respondent with the minor civil division in which the workplace was located or when a township and a city or borough of the same or similar name are located close together.

The wording of the question on place of work was substantially the same in the 1990 census as it was in 1980. However, data on place of work from the 1990 census are based on the full census sample, while data from the 1980 census were based on only about one-half of the full sample. For the 1980 census, nonresponse or incomplete responses to the place-of-work question were not allocated, resulting in the use of "not reported" categories in the 1980 publications. However, for the 1990 census, when place of work was not reported or the response was incomplete, a work location was allocated to the person based on their means of transportation to work, travel time to work, industry, and location of residence and workplace of others. The 1990 publications, therefore, do not contain a "not reported" category for the place-of-work data.

Comparisons between 1980 and 1990 census data on the gross number of workers in particular commuting flows, or the total number of persons working in an area, should be made with extreme caution. Any apparent increase in the magnitude of the gross numbers may be due solely to the fact that for 1990 the "not reported" cases have been distributed among specific place-of-work destinations, instead of tallied in a separate category as in 1980. In this report, the numbers in tables have been distributed.

**Limitations.** The data on place of work relate to a reference week; that is, the calendar week preceding the date on which the respondents completed their questionnaires or were interviewed by enumerators. This week is not the same for all respondents because the enumeration was not completed in 1 week. However, for the majority of persons, the reference week for the 1990

census is the last week in March 1990. The lack of a uniform reference week means that the place-of-work data reported in the census will not exactly match the distribution of workplace locations observed or measured during an actual workweek. The place-of-work data are estimates of persons 16 years old and over who were both employed and at work during the reference week (including persons in the Armed Forces). Therefore, the data on place of work understate the total number of jobs or total employment in a geographical area during the reference week. It also should be noted that persons who had irregular, casual, or unstructured jobs during the reference week may have erroneously reported themselves as not working.

The address where the individual worked most often during the reference week was recorded on the census questionnaire. If a worker held two jobs, only data about the primary job (the one worked the greatest number of hours during the preceding week) was requested. Persons who regularly worked in several locations during the reference week were requested to give the address at which they began each day. For cases in which daily work was not begun at a central place each day, the person was asked to provide as much information as possible to describe the area in which he or she worked most during the reference week.

**Means of Transportation.** The data on means of transportation to work were derived from answers to questionnaire item 23a, which was asked of persons who indicated in question 21 that they worked at some time during the reference week. Means of Transportation to work refers to the principal mode of travel or type of conveyance that the person usually used to get from home to work during the reference week.

Persons who used different means of transportation on different days of the week were asked to specify the one they used most often. Persons who used more than one means of transportation to get to work each day were asked to report the one used for the longest distance during the work trip. The category, "Public transportation," includes workers who used a bus or trolley bus, streetcar or trolley car, subway or elevated rail, railroad, ferryboat, or taxicab even if each mode is not identified separately within the data distribution. The category, "Other means," may vary from table to table, depending on the amount of detail shown in a particular distribution.

The means of transportation data for some areas may show workers using modes of public transportation that are not available in those areas (e.g., subway or elevated riders in a metropolitan area where there actually is no subway or elevated service). This result is largely due to persons who worked during the reference week at a location that was different from their usual place of work (such as persons away from home on business in an area where subway service was available) and persons who used more than one means of transportation each day but whose principal means was unavailable where they lived (for example, residents of nonmetropolitan areas who drove to the fringe of an metropolitan area and took the commuter railroad most of the distance to work).

**Private Vehicle Occupancy.** The data on private vehicle occupancy were derived from answers to questionnaire item 23b. This question was asked of persons who indicated in question 21 that they worked at some time during the reference week and who reported in question 23a that their means of transportation to work was "car, truck, or van." Private vehicle occupancy refers to the number of persons who usually rode to work in the vehicle during the reference week. Other transportation discussions on vehicle occupancy may use occupancy that is weighted by trip length.

The category, "Drove alone," includes persons who usually drove alone to work as well as persons who were driven to work by someone who then drove back home or to a nonwork destination. The

category, "Carpooled," includes workers who reported that two or more persons usually rode to work in the vehicle during the reference week.

The measure persons per car, truck, or van is obtained by dividing the number of persons who reported using a car, truck, or van to get to work by the number of such vehicles that they used. The number of vehicles used is derived by counting each person who drove alone as one vehicle, each person who reported being in a two-person carp001 as one-half vehicle, each person who reported being in a three-person carp001 as on, and then summing all the vehicles.

**Time Leaving Home to Go to Work.** The data on time leaving home to go to work were derived from answers to questionnaire item 24a. This question was asked of persons who indicated in question 21 that they worked at some time during the reference week and who reported in question 23a that they worked outside their home. The departure time refers to the time of day that the person usually left home to go to work during the reference week.

**Travel Time to Work.** The data on travel time to work were derived from answers to questionnaire item 24b. This question was asked of persons who indicated in question 21 that they worked at some time during the reference week and who reported in question 23a that they worked outside their home. Travel time to work refers to the total number of minutes that it usually took the person to get from home to work during the reference week. The elapsed time includes time spent waiting for public transportation, picking up passengers in Carpools, and time spent in other activities related to getting to work.



#### **Chapter 2**

#### NATIONAL SUMMARY

#### **Commuting Indicators**

**Thirty Year Trends.** Commuting behavior by U.S. workers can be viewed as an outcome of demographic characteristics, the supply and location of jobs, the costs and availability of various commuting options, and perceived travel time. Over the 1960- 1990 period there were a number of factors that influenced commuting behavior in both quantity and magnitude. Table 2-1 highlights national data from the 1960, 1970, 1980 and 1990 decennial censuses and their journey-to-work components.<sup>1</sup> This table compares broad measures and characteristics of the population, workers, commuting activities, and mode of travel. Table 2-2 displays similar information for the 1960-1990 period, but focuses on comparisons between totals for the U.S. and large metropolitan areas with over one million inhabitants.

As the two tables show, over the period 1960-1990 the U.S. general population increased from 179 million to almost 249 million. Meanwhile, the number of workers rose from about 65 million to 115 million, or almost twice the growth rate of the population. There was also a sharp drop in household size. In 1960, the typical household had 3.33 persons, but by 1990 household size had diminished to 2.63 persons – a decrease of 21%. The totals for large metropolitan areas show results comparable to the U.S. figures. Table 2-2 shows greater growth for population and workers in metropolitan areas, but much of the difference is caused by the addition of several new metropolitan areas over the period. The percentage of workers commuting by privately owned vehicles (POV) is higher outside of the metropolitan areas. Otherwise, the ratios show little difference between the U.S. and metropolitan areas.

Throughout the period, the percent of workers who worked outside their county of residence grew by over 200%, suggesting the progressive suburbanization of places of work. With greater economic activity came a higher standard of living for many households, and with it the ability to buy more automobiles. The Interstate Highway System was virtually completed during these years. The total number of vehicles in households increased over threefold. The average household in 1960 had only 1.03 vehicles, but by 1990 it had 1.66 vehicles. The fastest rising category during the period was households with three or more vehicles. By 1990, nearly 16 million U.S. households had three or more vehicles, or about 17% of all U.S. households.

During the 1960-1990 period, the baby-boomers grew from a population of school-aged children into working adults in their thirties and forties. The rapid growth in U.S. workers was driven in large measure by these baby-boomers entering the labor force. Also of note was the increase in workers per household, representing an increase in women in the labor force. In 1960, females made up 33.6% of all workers in large metropolitan area, but by 1990 females formed 45.6% of total workers. Another important change was a declining birth rate. In 1960, the U.S. had a birth rate per of 23.8 per thousand, but by 1990, the birth rate had dropped to 16.7.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For the sake of clarity, and in order to illuminate these broader trends, the subject of geographic redefinition of metropolitan areas is left for later chapters. While such changes are not ordinarily evident in state and national level tabulations, readers for now should keep in mind that issues of geography and measurement are closely linked.

<sup>2</sup> The birth rate appears to have bottomed out in 1986 at 15.5.

Table 2-1. Journey-to-Work	Comparisons,	National Totals,	1960-1990
----------------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------

					Percent Change			
DATA ITEMS	1960	1970	1980	1990	1960-70	1970-80	1980-90	1960-90
POPULATION								
Total	179,323,175	203,211,926	226,545,805	248,709,873	13.32	11.48	9.78	38.69
Number of Households	53,022,121	63,444,750	80,389,673	91,993,582	19.66	26.71	14.43	73.50
Persons per Household	3.33	3.11	2.75	2.63	-6.61	-11.58	-4.36	-21.02
Persons per Vehicle	3.27	2.57	1.75	1.63	-21.44	-32.12	-6.52	-50.15
Households per Vehicle	0.97	0.80	0.62	0.60	-17.05	-22.85	-2.56	-37.64
Urban Population	125,268,750	149,646,029	167,050,992	187,051,543	19.46	11.63	11.97	49.32
Rural Population	54,054,525	53,565,297	59,494,813	61,658,330	-0.91	11.07	3.64	14.07
Percent Urban	69.86%	73.64%	73.74%	75.21%	5.42	0.13	1.99	7.66
WORKERS								
Total	64,655,805	76,852,389	96,617,296	115,070,274	18.86	25.72	19.10	77.97
Workers as Percent of Population	36.06%	37.82%	42.65%	46.27%	4.89	12.77	8.49	28.32
Worked in County of Residence	55,254,625	62,065,319	76,564,160	87,587,677	12.33	23.36	14.40	58.52
Worked Outside County of Residence	9,401,180	14,784,070	20,108,023	27,482,597	57.26	36.01	36.67	192.33
Workers per Household	1.22	1.21	1.20	1.25	-0.66	-0.78	4.08	2.58
Workers per Vehicle	1.18	0.97	0.74	0.76	-17.60	-23.45	1.41	-36.03
COMMUTING (1)								
Meau Travel Time to Work			21.7	22.4			3.23	
Private Vehicle (2)	42,987,904	61,963,414	83,016,457	101,285,208	44.14	33.98	22.01	135.61
% Private Vehicle	69.48%	80.63%	85.92%	88.02%	16.05	6.57	2.44	26.69
Public Tmusit (3)	7,806,932	6,514,012	6,007,728	5,890,155	-16.56	-7.77	-1.96	-24.55
% Transit	12.62%	8.48%	6.22%	5.12%	-32.82	-26.64	-17.68	-59.43
Walked to Work	6,416,343	5,689,819	5,413,248	4,488,886	-11.32	-4.86	-17.08	-30.04
% walked	10.37%	7.40%	5.60%	3.90%	-28.61	-24.32	-30.37	-62.38
Worked at Home	4,662,750	2,685,144	2,179,863	3,406,025	-42.41	-18.82	56.25	-26.95
% Worked At Home	7.54%	3.49%	2.26%	2.96%	-53.64	-35.43	31.19	-60.72
VEHICLES (4)								
Total Household Vehicles (5)	54,766,718	79,002,052	129,747,911	152,380,479	44.25	64.23	17.44	178.24
Vehicles per Household	1.03	1.25	1.61	1.66	20.55	29.62	2.63	60.37
Vehicles per Person	0.31	0.39	0.57	0.61	27.29	47.32	6.98	100.61
Vehicles per Worker	0.85	1.03	1.34	1.32	21.36	30.64	-1.39	56.34
Households with 0 Vehicles	11,416,835	11,081,394	10,390,307	10,602,297	-2.94	-6.24	2.04	-7.13
% with 0 Vehicles	21.53%	17.47%	12.92%	11.53%	-18.88	-26.00	-10.83	-46.48
Households with 1 Vehicle	30,189,103	30,268,323	28,564,622	31,038,711	0.26	-5.63	8.66	2.81
% with 1 Vehicle	56.94%	47.71%	35.53%	33.74%	-16.21	-25.52	-5.04	-40.74
Households with 2 Vehicles	10,073,684	18,599,907	27,347,235	34,361,045	84.64	47.03	25.65	241.10
% with 2 Vehicles	19.00%	29.32%	34.02%	37.35%	54.3 1	16.04	9.80	96.60
Households with 3+ Vehicles	1,342,499	3,495,126	14,087,509	15,945,357	160.34	303.06	13.19	1,087.74
% with 3+ Vehicles	2.53%	5.51%	17.52%	17.33%	117.58	218.10	-1.09	584.57

(1) Does not include means of travel to work not reported for 1960 of 2,781,876.

(2) Includes cars, trucks, vans, bicycles, motorcycles, taxicabs, and all other means,

(3) Public Transit includes bus, streetcar, subway. railroad, and ferries.

(4) Vehicles include automobile only for 1960 and 1970. For 1980 and 1990. it includes cars. vans, and trucks of one ton capacity or less kept at home for use by members of the household.

(5) Households with three or more vehicles assumed 3.3 vehicles per household.

U.S. Factor Totals	Metropolitan Area Totals <sup>3</sup>
Population	
1960 179,323,175	77,175,875
1990 248,709,873	123,814,261
Percent Change 38.69%	
Workers	
1960 64,655,805	29,033,438
1990 115,070,274	
Percent Change	
Male/Female Worker Ratio	
1960 67.7%/32.3%	
1990 54.7%/45.3%	
Persons/Household	
1960 3.33	3.24
1990 2.63	2.65
Percent Change 21.02	-21.40%
Workers/Household	
1960 1.22	1.24
1990 1.25	1.31
Percent Change	5.65%
Vehicles/Household	
1960 1.03	1.00
1990 1.66	1.59
Percent Change 60.37%	
Vehicles/Person	
1960 0.31	0.31
1990 0.61	
Percent Change 100.61%	
% Workers Traveling by POV	
1960 66.49%	
1990 88.02%	

## Table 2-2. National Trends 1960-1990 Factors, U.S. Totals Compared to Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The list of metropolitan areas over one million has increased over the thirty year period from thirty-four to thirty-nine areas. In addition, there have been a few areas that lost population and hence no longer on the list. These facts should be considered when interpreting this table.

Over the past thirty years, many areas of the country have been making the transition from a manufacturing based labor force to service sector jobs. Service sector employment in the U.S. has displaced the predominant role held by manufacturing for many decades. The concentrated centers of industrial activity that characterized manufacturing employment in the early years of the 1960-1990 period are now being replaced by the service sector and high technology jobs of the 1990's.

The geographies of metropolitan areas have been altered to accommodate the increasingly decentralized nature of workers' places of work and residences. Metropolitan areas on the East and West coasts, in particular, have grown geographically closer, as populations and jobs alike have spread out from the urban cores. Some neighboring metropolitan areas no longer have rural or semi-rural areas separating them.

During the thirty years, American workers continued to convey their established preference for private automobile travel. Noteworthy is the large amount of highway construction that took place during the early part of the period, providing the capacity for more vehicles. Compared to 1960 and 1970 data on surfaced roadways, however, current data reflects a slowing of construction in recent years.<sup>4</sup> Sales of new passenger cars totaled 6.7 million in 1960, and about 6 million in 1990, despite several years of more robust sales in the 1970's and early 1980's. People are keeping their cars for a longer time; the average age of a household vehicle grew from 5.1 years in 1969 to 7.7 years in 1990.<sup>5</sup>

Looking ahead, new technologies in telecommunications and transportation promise to lessen the differences between traditional central business districts and dispersed employment areas of the suburbs. Service sector employment is transforming how jobs are performed, the time it takes to accomplish them, where they are located, and the mode of travel used to reach them. For example, the technology to permit people to work at home through computer networks is changing rapidly. This technology may have significant impacts on journey-to-work decisions, but we do not as yet know the scope or the timing of these impacts.

**Ten Year Trends.** The trends between 1980 and 1990 include smaller but increasing numbers of households, population dispersion, increasing urbanization, a large growth in workers particularly in the service sector, and increasing female labor force participation. Housing costs increased in the East and West coasts during the 1980's. Housing costs are a major determinant of residence location, and could have indirectly affected journey-to-work data in those locales. Table 2-3 below compares ten year trends for metropolitan areas with U.S. totals for some common commuting factors. In the 1980's population in the U.S. grew by 9.78%, while in large metropolitan areas it grew by 11.81%. The number of workers rose at over twice the rate of population. Both workers per household and vehicles per household were slightly higher outside metropolitan areas.

<sup>4</sup> Data from the FHWA's Highway Statistics shows the following:

U.S. Road and Street	1960	1970	1980	1990
Mileage, Surfaced (millions)	2.56	2.95	3 36	3 52

<sup>5</sup> Source: Hu, P.S., and Young, J. "Summary of Travel Trends, 1990 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey" (U.S. DOT/FHWA, March 1992).

Factor	U.S. Totals	Metropolitan Area Totals
Population		
1980	. 226,545,805	110,732,144
1990	. 248,709,873	123,814,261
Percent Change	9.78%	11.81%
Workers		
1980	96,617,296	
1990	. 115,070,274	
Percent Change	19.10%	
Workers/Household		
1980	1.20	1.18
1990	1.25	1.24
Vehicles/Household		
1980	1.61	1.52
1990	1.66	1.59

 Table 23. Ten Year Trends in Journey-to-Work Factors, U.S. Totals Compared to Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants (based on 1983 geography)

Table 2-4 presents a detailed profile of national and metropolitan data for 1990 only. Information is provided on population, workers, travel time, vehicles, mode, and other related indicators for the U.S. as a whole, the thirty-nine metropolitan areas over one million, and the remainder of the nation.<sup>6</sup> The thirty-nine metropolitan areas account for almost 50% of the U.S. population, and almost half the total household vehicles, but only 5% of the land area. Almost 52% of all U.S. workers are employed within these metropolitan areas. In 1990, many other comparisons between the U.S. and large metropolitan areas are similar. Metropolitan area household income was just slightly higher in metropolitan areas. Mean travel time was 22.4 minutes in the U.S., versus 25.2 minutes in the metropolitan areas. Outside the large metropolitan areas, drive alone commutes were a little higher, and transit usage was lower. These and other comparisons are listed in Table 2-5 below.

From 1980-1990, both residential and employment densities continued to increase in suburban counties, maintaining a trend that had become well-established in the 1970's. Additional changes consisted of rising vehicle ownership rates, smaller and more fuel efficient cars, and increases in commuters who drove alone. Later in this report, these factors are examined in more detail. From 1980-1990, at the national level, travel times to work did not rise much, although some differences are found among metropolitan areas. In 1980, the average reported travel time for the U.S. as a whole was 21.7 minutes, and by 1990 that figure had risen to 22.4 minutes. The relatively small increase may reflect more driving alone. Also, some commuters shifted from slower to faster modes of transportation. Table 2-6 provides a summary of journey-to-work trends from 1980-1990, and lists supporting facts from the 1990 Census.

<sup>6</sup> This table is duplicated in the Profiles section of this report, preceding the profiles for each of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas.
Demographics and Land Are	<b>a</b> 248 709 873	Travel Time Mean (in minutes)		Journey to Work by Mode	
% Inside 30 Metro Areas	240,709,073 70 78	Driginating in:		% Drive Alone	73 10
% Demainder of Nation	49.78 50.22	Nation	22.20	% Corrected	12.26
% Remainder of Nation	30.22 75.21	Nation 20 Matrix Areas	22.30	% Calpooled % Public Transit	15.50
% Urban	75.21	39 Metro Areas	23.20 10.20	% Fublic Halish	0.21
70 Kulai	24.79	Remainder of Nation	19.30	% Walk	3 00
<b>T</b> (1) <b>H</b> (1) 1	01 002 592			% walk	5.90
Total Households	91,993,582	Commute Length		% Bicycle	0.41
Persons Per Household	2.05	Commute Length		% Work at Home	0.70
Medien Henryhold Income		National		% work at nome	2.96
Nationwide	\$20,229	National	15.07	Inside 39 Metro Areas	70 75
	\$30,338	% Less Than 15 Winutes	15.0/	% Drive Alone	10.75
Inside 39 Metro Areas	\$31,010	% 15 - 29 Minutes	51.04	% Carpooled	12.09
Remainder of Nation	\$29,005	% 50 - 59 Minutes	14.00	% Public Transit	8.98
National Age Characteristics		% 40 - 59 Minutes	9.01 5.96	% Wolls	0.21
Madional Age Characteristics	22.00	% of Winutes of More	5.80	% walk	5.70
Median Age	32.90	Incide 20 Matrix Arreas		% Dicycle	0.45
% 15 Years or Less	12.67	Miside 59 Metro Areas	11.45	% Work at Home	0.02
% 65 Tears of More	12.30	% Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 20 Minutes	11.43	% work at nonne Remainder of Nation	2.57
Sauana Milas		% 15 - 29 Minutes	49.22	% Drive Alone	75 91
Square Miles	2 526 229	% 50 - 59 Minutes	17.40	% Carrooled	14.00
National Total	5,550,558	% 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or Moro	7 52	% Public Transit	14.09
% Remainder of Nation	04 73	70 00 Windles of Wore	1.52	% Motorevela	0.20
70 Remainder of Nation	74.75	Remainder of Nation		% Walk	4.06
			20.62	% waik	4.00
Workers	115 050 054	% Less Than 15 Minutes	20.63	% Bicycle	0.38
National Total	115,070,274	% 15 - 29 Minutes	54.24	% Other	0.79
% of Population	46.3	% 30 - 39 Minutes	11.62	% Work at Home	3.39
% Male	54.7	% 40 - 59 Minutes	6.04	~	
% Female	45.3	% 60 Minutes or More	4.07	General Indicators	
Inside 39 Metro Areas	59,704,401			National	
% Inside 39 Metro Areas	51.89			Population/Sq. Mile	70
Remainder of Nation	55,365,873	Time Workers Leave Home		Households/Sq. Mile	26
% Remainder of Nation	48.11			Workers/Sq. Mile	33
		National		Workers/Household	1.25
Household Vehicle Availabilit	y	5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	26.04	Vehicles/Household	1.66
National		7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	41.87	Vehicles/Worker	1.32
Total Vehicles	152,380,479	8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	10.28	Workers/Vehicle	0.76
% 0 Vehicles	11.53	All Other Departures	18.85	Inside 39 Metro Areas	
% 1 Vehicles	33.76	Worked at Home	2.96	Population/Sq. Mile	664
% 2 Vehicles	37.37			Households/Sq. Mile	245
% 3+Vehicles	17.34	Inside 39 Metro Areas		Workers/Sq. Mile	320
Inside 39 Metro Areas	53 464 000	5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	25.49	Workers/Household	1.31
Total Vehicles	72,464,899	7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	42.44	Vehicles/Household	1.59
% 0 Vehicles	14.02	8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	11.57	Vehicles/Worker	1.21
% 1 Vehicles	34.00	All Other Departures	17.93	workers/venicle	0.82
% 2 venicles	35.85	worked at Home	2.57	Remainder of Nation	27
% 3+ Venicles Demainder of Nation	10.12	Demainder of Nation		Population/Sq. Mile	5/
	70.015 500	Kemainder of INation	06.60	Housenoids/Sq. Mile	14
Iotal Vehicles	/9,915,580	5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	26.63	worker/Sq. Mile	1/
% U Vehicles	9.08	7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	41.26	workers/Household	1.19
% I venicies	35.52	6.50 AW - 9.59 AM	8.88	venicies/Household	1.72
% 2 Vehicles	38.86	All Other Departures	19.84	Vehicles/Worker	1.44
% 3+ Vehicles	18.54	Worked at Home	3.39	workers/vehicle	0.69

# Table 2-4. Journey-to-Work Profile: National Summary Statistics (1990)

Factor	U.S. Totals	Metropolitan Area Totals
Population Per Square Mile	70	 664
Workers Per Square Mile	33	 320
Median Household Income	\$30,338	 \$3 1,016
Mean Travel Time (minutes)	22.4	 25.2
Total Vehicles (millions)	152.4	 72.5
% Workers Driving Alone	73.2	 70.8
% Workers Carpooling	13.4	 12.7
% Workers Using Transit	5.3	 9.0

 Table 2-5. Selected Demographic and Commuting Comparisons, U.S. and Large Metropolitan Areas, 1990

In analyzing large data sets, it is often helpful to quickly scan the range of statistics, such as those presented in Tables 2-7 and 2-8. These tables compare selected maximum and minimum data values for states and metropolitan areas, respectively. Metropolitan area level data frequently parallel the state level data in terms of maximum and minimum values. This suggests that similar patterns are occurring at micro and macro levels within a state, or that the effects of a large metropolitan area dominate state data totals. Work trips in the state of New York averaged 27.8 minutes, while trips in North Dakota required an average of only 11.9 minutes. For the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, New York state had both the metropolitan area with the highest and the area with the lowest mean travel times in 1990. The highest mean travel time was 31.7 minutes in New York City, the lowest was in Buffalo at 19.4 minutes.

**Household Formations.** The pattern of more but smaller households seems firmly in place and may hold significance both for journey-to-work decisions and transportation planning. From 1960-1990, the number of U.S. households rose from 53 million in 1960 to 92 million in 1990, an almost 75% increase. The increase in the number of households is also reflected in declining household size. In 1980, the average household had 2.75 people. This dropped 4.4% in 1990 to 2.63 people per household.

**Urban Populations.7** From 1960-1990, the urban population in the country advanced by nearly 50%, compared to a corresponding rural population increase of 14%. By 1990, three-fourths of all persons lived within areas defined as urban. For the entire United States, urban population rose in the 1980's by almost 12%. Individual states varied widely; Nevada's urban population rose over 55%, and both Alaska and Arizona rose over 40%. On the other hand, West Virginia had a loss of 8.1% in urban residents, and Louisiana and Iowa had small losses as well. The data indicate that migration to high growth states is concentrated in their urban areas.

**Growth in the Number of Workers.** From 1960 to 1990, the total number of workers in the U.S. grew in absolute terms by 78%. The U.S. had over 115 million workers in 1990, about 46.3% of the total population. In 1960, only 36.1% of the population were workers. Nationwide, the number of workers sixteen years old and older increased sharply in the 1980-1990 period, both in absolute figures

<sup>7</sup> The Census Bureau defines "urban" for the 1990 census as comprising all territory, population, and housing units in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more persons outside urbanized areas, All other area is classified as rural. Also, the Census Bureau defines an Urbanized Area (UA) as one or more places (central place) and the adjacent densely settled surrounding territory (urban fringe) that together have a minimum of 50,000 persons.

Indicator	Trends	Facts
Population and House- holds	<ul> <li>Declines in household size.</li> <li>Lower, then higher birth rates.</li> <li>Population dispersion to outlying areas and migration to sunbelt states.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Persons per household dropped 4.4%, from 2.75 to 2.63.</li> <li>U.S. population grew from 226.5 million to 248.7 million, or 9.8%.</li> <li>In 1990, South Atlantic Census area had highest rate of immigration from other states (14.3%).</li> <li>Birth rates per thousand: 15.9 in 1980, 15.6 in 1983, 16.7 in 1990.</li> <li>Median U.S. age rose from 30 to 32.8.</li> </ul>
Economic and Em- ployment Factors	<ul> <li>Growth in service sector jobs.</li> <li>Price declines in gasoline.</li> <li>Lower inflation.</li> <li>Highway construction slows.</li> <li>Increase in female workers.</li> <li>Aging workforce.</li> <li>Staggered/flexible work hours.</li> <li>Increase in work at home jobs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Service sector: 30.9% of all jobs in 1980, 40.3% in 1990.</li> <li>Percent change in consumer price index: 13.5% in 1980, 5.4% in 1990.</li> <li>Average retail price of unleaded regular gasoline: \$1.25 in 1980, \$1.16 in 1990.</li> <li>Female workers rose from 42.4% to 45.6% of labor force.</li> <li>Workers who work at home rose from 2.2 million to 3.4 million, or 56.3%.</li> </ul>
Commuting Character- istics	<ul> <li>Increases in workers who drive alone.</li> <li>Carpools and public transit declines.</li> <li>Travel times increased slightly.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Workers driving alone increased by 35.4%.</li> <li>Workers using Carpools fell by 19.3%, public transit decreased 1.96%.</li> <li>Mean travel time: 21.7 minutes in 1980, 22.4 minutes in 1990.</li> <li>Workers employed outside their county of residence increased by 36.7%.</li> </ul>
Vehicles	<ul> <li>Rising vehicle ownership rates.</li> <li>Gains in fuel efficiency.</li> <li>Downsizing of motor vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Vehicles per household rose from 1.61 to 1.66.</li> <li>Households with two vehicles increased by 25.7%. Households with three or more vehicles rose by 13.2%.</li> <li>Average miles per gallon for cars: 15.5 in 1980, 21 in 1990.</li> </ul>
Source (apart	from this report): Statistical Abstract of the United St	tates

 Table 2-6. Indicators, Trends, and Factsheet for Journey-to-Work Patterns, 1980-1990

## Table 2-7. Journey to Work, 1990, Maximums and Minimums by State

#### Choice of Mode to Work in 1990

Mode Choice	<u>State</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Minimum</u>
Drive Alone Carpool Public Transit Walk Work at Home	Michigan Hawaii New York District of Columbia . South Dakota	81.5%          20.5%          24.8%          11.8%          9.5%	New York South Dakota South Dakota Alabama	54.3% 10.1% . 0.3% . 1.9% 1.8%
Other	Alaska	4.5%	Minnesota	. 0.5%

## Household Vehicle Ownership in 1990

Households With	<u>State</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Minimum</u>
Zero Vehicles	New York	30.0%          41.0%          44.2%          27.4%	Idaho	4.6%
One Vehicle	Florida		Idaho	28.1%
Two Vehicles	New Hampshire		New York	26.5%
Three or More Vehicles	Wyoming		New York	11.1%

## **Commuting Indicators From the 1990 Census**

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Minimum</u>
Mean Travel Time				
To Work (minutes)	New York	27.80	North Dakota	11.90
Persons Per Household	Utah	3.15	Florida	. 2.46
Workers Per Household	Hawaii	1.59	West Virginia	. 0.97
Workers as Percent of				
Population	Maryland	51.90%	West Virginia	34.30%
Vehicles Per Household	Wyoming	. 1.98	New York	. 1.22
Vehicles Per Worker	Montana	1.66	New York	. 0.98
Workers Per Vehicle	New York	. 1.02	Montana	. 0.60
Median Household				
Income	Connecticut	\$41,721	Mississippi	\$20,136

## Choice of Mode to Work in 1990

	Metropolitan		Metropolitan	
Mode Choice	Area	<u>Maximum</u>	Area	<u>Minimum</u>
Drive Alone	Detroit	82.70%	New York City	. 52.30%
Carpool	Washington, D.C	15.80%	Boston	. 10.30%
Public Transit	New York City	27.80%	Татра	. 1.60%
Walk	New York City	6.50%	Atlanta	. 1.50%
Work at Home	Norfolk	5.30%	New Orleans	. 1.70%
Other	Norfolk	1.10%	Minneapolis	. 0.40%

## Household Vehicle Ownership in 1990

Households With	Metropolitan Area	<u>Maximum</u>	Metropolitan <u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum</u>
Zero Vehicles	New York City	31.60%          44.40%          42.10%          22.40%	Salt Lake City	6.10%
One Vehicle	Tampa		Salt Lake City	29.50%
Two Vehicles	Salt Lake City		New York City	25.30%
Three or More Vehicles	Salt Lake City		New Orleans	10.80%

## **Commuting Indicators From the 1990 Census**

	Metropolitan		Metropolitan	
Indicator_	<u>Area</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	Area	Minimum
Mean Travel Time				
To Work (minutes)	New York City	31.10	Buffalo	19.40
Persons Per Household	Salt Lake City	. 3.04	Tampa	2.32
Workers Per Household	Washington, D.C	. 1.52	Tampa	1.05
Workers as Percent of			1	
Population	Washington, D.C	56.40%	New Orleans	41.50%
Vehicles Per Household	Salt Lake City	1.88	New York City	1.20
Vehicles Per Worker	Sacramento/Tampa .	. 1.45	New York City	0.93
Workers Per Vehicle	New York City	. 1.08	Sacramento/Tampa	0.69
Median Household				
Income	Washington, D.C	\$46,856	New Orleans	\$24,442

and as a percentage of the resident population. Total workers rose by over 19%, more than twice the growth of the total resident population. Nevada led all states with a 52% increase in workers, followed closely by Alaska and Florida.

A significant proportion of the increase in workers may be attributable to the increase of women in the workforce (Table 2-9). Recent data<sup>8</sup> indicate a compound annual growth rate of 2.9% for female workers compared to 1.6% for male workers. The labor force participation rates by sex over the 1960-1990 period reveal the changing mix.

Sex	1960	1970	1980	1990	
Male Female	83.3% 37.7	79.7% 43.3	77.4% 51.5	76.1% 57.5	

Table 2-7. Labor Force I articipation Rates by Sex, Tercentages, 1700-1770
--

**Workers per Household.** The average number of workers per household remained nearly the same during 1960 to 1980. From 1980-1990, workers per household rose from 1.20 to 1.25, an increase of 4%. This apparently static trend must be evaluated in combination with dramatic declines in household size. In 1960, there were 1.22 workers and an average household size of 3.33. In 1990, there was an average of 1.25 workers, and average household size of 2.63.

During the past decade, a 9% increase in workers per household was recorded in California, while New York and New Jersey each had gains of about 8%. Workers per household fell in Texas, Louisiana, and Wyoming, probably due to weakness in the energy industry.

California was the only state with an increase in persons per household. This ratio rose by over 4% from 1980-1990. Possible explanations include: a large immigrant population; above average birth rates; and high housing costs, forcing more people to share living quarters. Taking 1985 as the midpoint year of the 1980's, California had several metropolitan areas among the leaders in median sales prices of existing single family homes. Also in 1985, California's birth rate per thousand was 17.9, compared to a national average of 15.8.<sup>9</sup>

**Density Indicators.** Figure 2-1 illustrates several data series (persons, vehicles, workers, households) expressed in terms of square miles in the metropolitan area. Population density is always the highest of these measures, and produces similar increases in the other data. The numbers show fairly uniform correlation across the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, only the older industrialized areas like New York, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia display much higher densities. In these cities, most of the indicators lie well above 500 units per square mile.

<sup>8</sup> Employment and Earnings, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, p.173, January 1993.

<sup>9</sup> Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States.



## Figure 2-1. Selected Density Indicators, 1990 - 39 Metropolitan Areas

Care must be exercised in interpreting these densities. Metropolitan area boundaries are periodically redefined to add new counties, often with lower densities. The net effect is that densities are often diluted, although the densities in the previously defined metropolitan area may have increased.

The distribution of worker densities closely matches changes in population density. Some exceptions should be noted, since local demographics can create atypical differences. Sunbelt locations, for example, generally have a higher incidence of retirees resulting in lower work densities.

#### Choice of Mode to Work

Driving alone to work has consistently increased at each census point from 1960 to 1990 while carpooling has consistently decreased. Figure 2-2 compares the thirty-nine metropolitan areas with nationwide totals of mode choice for the journey to work. In metropolitan areas, 9% of the journey-to-work trips are made using transit, compared to 5% nationwide. The 4% difference is largely comprised of commuters who drive alone (73.4% for U.S. and 71% for metropolitan areas) or travel in vehicle pools (13.4% for U.S. and 12.7% for metropolitan areas). The percentage of people who work at home shows little difference between national and metropolitan area totals.

**Driving Alone.** Over the thirty year period, the number of people driving alone to work has increased almost without interruption. The use of private vehicles for commuting grew by more than 135% over the period. In 1960, almost forty-three million commuters drove alone and by 1990, the number had risen to 101 million. As a share of all commuting trips, the use of private vehicles increased by just under 30% during this period.

One of the major results of the 1990 journey-to-work data, compared to 1980, is the increase in commuters who drove alone, both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of all trips. In 1980, 64.4% of all commuters drove to work alone. By 1990, the drive alone share increased to 73.2%. The increase in the number of drive alone commuters in the U.S. was over 35%.

**Carpooling.** From 1980 to 1990, commuters using car-pools declined substantially, falling 32% nationally. In 1990, the market share for car-pools was 13.3% nationwide. Carpool usage decreased the most in New England and the North Central states. Hawaii led all states in car-pooling in 1990 with 20.5% of commuting trips. The Washington, D.C. MSA registered the highest share of carpooling among metropolitan areas in 1990, with almost 16% of trips by that mode.

**Public Transit.** Public transit usage declined sharply over the period, but with temporary upsurges during the years of tight gasoline supplies in the 1970's. Workers using public transit totaled 7.8 million in 1960 and 5.9 million in 1990. During the 1970's and 1980's, new subway systems were built in the San Francisco Bay area, Atlanta, and Washington, DC. However, public transit use dropped by 25% altogether in the last thirty years.

In the 1980's, public transit lost market share in the journey to work, declining from 6.2% in 1980 to 5.1% in 1990. Most losses came at the expense of commuters driving alone. In 1990, the state of New York ranked first in taking public transit to work, with almost one quarter of all commuters using that mode. As a mode, public transit in the U.S. accounted for only about 5% of all journeys to work in 1990. Bus riders were the highest subcomponent of transit users at 3% of total journeys to work.

Figure 2-2. Means of Journey to Work, 1990 - National and Metropolitan Area Totals



**Walking to Work.** From 1960-1990, walking to work fell by 30%, dropping from 6.4 million in 1960 to 4.5 million in 1990. Its share of all commuting trips also decreased from 10.4% to 3.9%. The number of commuters who walked to work decreased nationally from 5.4 million in 1980 to 4.5 million in 1990.

**Working at Home.** Working at home showed an overall loss of 27% in the thirty year period, suggesting declines in farming activity. This category, however, displayed a sharp turnaround during the 1980's in both absolute numbers and its market share. In 1980, 2.2 million people worked at home. In 1990, there were 3.4 million in this category. This change may indicate increases in telecommuting or other service oriented work at home employment.

#### **Travel Time**

Nationwide, travel time to work rose by just 3.2% in the 1980's, increasing from 21.7 minutes to 22.4 minutes. Inside the thirty-nine metropolitan areas in 1990, the average travel time was 25.2 minutes. Ten states reported net decreases in travel time, headed by Wyoming with a 13.5% drop. The highest percent increases were located in New Hampshire, Hawaii, and California, all three states having above average population growth rates in the 1980's. In 1990, New York had the longest mean travel time with 28.6 minutes, while the fastest was 13 minutes in North Dakota. The modest increases from 1980 - 1990 may reflect more driving alone, as commuters shifted from slower to faster modes of transportation.

**Time Leaving Home.** A question added in the 1990 Census concerned departure time for work. There is no pronounced difference in departure times between the metropolitan areas and the rest of the nation. The majority of people both inside and outside metropolitan area chose to leave for work between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:29 A.M. The second most frequent departure interval was between 5:00 A.M. and 6:59 A.M. Inside the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, 25.49% left between 5:00 A.M. and 6:59 A.M. (Table 2-10).

Time	U.S.	Thirty-Nine
Interval	Totals	Metropolitan Areas
5:00 A.M 6:59 A.M 7:00 A.M 8:29 A.M 8:30 A.M 9:59 A.M All Other Departures Worked at Home	26.04% 41.87% 10.28% 18.85% 2.96%	25.49%         42.44%         11.27%         17.93%         2 57%

Table 2-10. Departure Times to Work, U.S. and Metropolitan Area Comparisons, 1990

#### **Total Vehicles and Vehicles Per Household**

Over the past thirty years, privately owned vehicles have become pervasive in U.S. households. Although automobiles still constitute the largest component of private vehicles, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of light trucks, vans, and utility vehicles for private travel. According to the Bureau of the Census, the availability of household vehicles in the U.S. from 1960-1990 increased 178%. This is based on 54.8 million vehicles available in 1960 and 152.4 million in 1990.<sup>10</sup> Vehicles per household increased from 1.03 to 1.66 during the period, or about 60%. Vehicles per worker also rose by a slightly smaller amount with the greatest increases occurring in the 1970's for both measures.

A number of factors contributed to the 1960-1990 increases. These include rising household incomes, growth in the number of workers per household, and decentralization of jobs and residences. The rapid growth in female workers is probably a leading factor behind the growth in total vehicles, as two-income households and female-headed households often acquire a separate vehicle for each worker.

During the 1980-1990 period, U.S. households acquired 17.4% more vehicles. In 1990, the thirtynine metropolitan areas accounted for nearly 72.5 million vehicles in U.S. households, about 48% of all U.S. household vehicles. California heads all states with over 18 million vehicles, and the Los Angeles CMSA alone accounted for nearly 8.6 million vehicles, the greatest total among the metropolitan areas. Texas, New York, Florida and Ohio also had large numbers of household vehicles.

The Salt Lake City CMSA had the highest rate among metropolitan areas with 1.88 vehicles per household in 1990. New York City, with 1.20 vehicles per household, had the lowest rate. Vehicles per household rose, 3.1% increase from 1980 to 1990. In 1990, Wyoming led all states with 1.98 vehicles per household, compared to a low of 1.22 in New York. Tampa had the highest level of vehicles per worker in 1990, with a ratio of 1.45. The average number of vehicles per person increased from 0.31 in 1960 to 0.61 in 1990. Thus, more and more, workers have at least one vehicle available to them at any time. This means that transit or carp001 trips for work are by choice and not dependency.

**Zero Vehicle Households.** The share of households without any vehicles declined by over 46% in the thirty year study period. Between 1980 and 1990 the absolute number of households with no vehicles available remained relatively constant, rising by a modest 2%. As a percentage of all households, however, this class declined by nearly 11%. By 1990, the share of households without vehicles accounted for just 11.5% of all U.S. households. The New York City CMSA is an important exception to the general trend, with a zero vehicle household share of 32% in its metropolitan area. It alone accounts for about 15% of the U.S. total households without any vehicle.

<sup>10</sup> The Census Bureau calculates household vehicles in a different way than the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and readers should take note of these differences in comparing Census data to other published data. In its annual publication *Highway Statistics* the FHWA includes commercial automobiles and commercial light trucks. Also, some commercial vehicles are kept at home and are likely to be counted by the Census Bureau as household vehicles. In 1990, the FHWA reported a total of 185.3 million registered vehicles, of which 143.6 million were automobiles, 37.4 million light trucks, and 4.3 million were motorcycles.

**One Vehicle Households.** From 1960-1990 households with only one vehicle available grew by less than 3%, remaining at roughly thirty million over the entire period. Like zero vehicle households, however, the relative share of such households plummeted by about 41%. In 1990, households with just one vehicle comprised around 34% of all U.S. households. The Tampa MSA had the highest share of one vehicle households in 1990.

In 1960, most households (56%) had only one vehicle, regardless of the number of adults living in the household. In 1990, with increases in vehicle availability, one vehicle households were most likely in areas with a high proportion of single adult households. This seems to be the case whether it be a young adult, a single parent, or an elderly widow(er). There is probably a high correlation between one vehicle households and persons over 65 years old.

**Two Vehicle Households.** During the 1960-1990 period, two vehicle households in absolute terms swelled by 241% nationwide, from just over 10 million to over 34 million. The relative share of these households also increased almost 97%. In 1990 tabulations, two vehicle households outnumber all others, accounting for about 37% of the total. In the 1980's, two vehicle households displayed the most consistent and strongest growth rates among these categories, rising over 25% nationwide. By 1990, over 44% of households in New Hampshire had two vehicles, the highest for any state. New York state, at 26.5%, had the smallest percentage. The Salt Lake City CMSA had the highest share of two vehicle households in the U.S. in 1990 (42.1%), while New York City had the lowest share (25.3%).

**Three or More Vehicle Households.** From 1960-1990, the number of households with three or more vehicles soared by nearly 1100%, increasing from about 1.3 million to nearly 16 million households. In 1960, households with three or more vehicles accounted for 2.5% of all households. By 1990, that share had risen to over 17% of all households. In 1990, the Salt Lake City CMSA had the highest share of households with three or more vehicles (22.4%). New Orleans had the smallest share (10.8%). Among metropolitan areas, growth rates for households with three or more vehicles were extremely strong in the 1970's, but weakened in the 1980's.

From 1980-1990, U.S. households with three or more vehicles rose in absolute terms by 13.2%. As a share of all households, however, this category remained nearly even between 1980 and 1990. In 1990, New York state had the lowest proportion of households in this category at around 11%, while Wyoming had a corresponding percentage of over 27%.

## Chapter 3

## **DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

This chapter describes aspects of population in the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, including trends for their central county and suburban counties. The effects of household formation and size are discussed along with household income, central county size, and urban population. Major themes from 1960-1990 include declining household size, increasing numbers of households, and rapid population growth in Sunbelt and suburban areas.

#### Population: Areawide, Central County, and Suburban County

From 1960-1990, the U.S. population increased from 179 million to 249 million, a gain of almost 40%. The 1960's produced the highest growth rate as population increased by 13.3%. Each succeeding decade produced a slower rate of growth. From 1980-1990, population increased by only 9.8%, the second lowest growth rate in census history. The Census Bureau attributed the decline primarily to a decrease in the rate of childbearing. Increases in immigration did not offset this low growth rate. Tables 3-1 and 3-1A show the growth rates for metropolitan areas over one million, Compared to U.S. totals, growth in the large metropolitan areas was generally stronger, rising 24% in the 1960's, 7.3% in the 1970's and 11.8% in the 1980's.

Table 3-2 lists the percent changes in the five fastest and five slowest growing metropolitan areas by decade during the 1960-1990 period. Phoenix was among the most rapidly growing areas in all three decades. Other metropolitan areas in the Sunbelt also appear more than once, such as San Diego, Miami, and Houston. Washington, D.C., grew 37% in the 1960's, the only northern metropolitan area in this category. By contrast, metropolitan areas in the slowest growing areas were consistent across the decades, with Pittsburgh, Buffalo and Cleveland appearing in each. In 1990, five metropolitan areas had populations of five million or more. New York City had the most with 17.1 million. Rochester was the smallest of the thirty-nine areas, with one million inhabitants.

**Comparative Growth Rates in Central Counties and Suburban Counties.** Much of the population growth in urban areas over the last thirty years occurred in the suburban counties. As shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-1 A, suburban counties displayed rapid growth compared to central counties. Table 3-3 below shows the metropolitan areas with the fastest growing suburban counties between 1960 and 1990. In addition, it may be argued that those metropolitan areas that are exclusively or predominantly central counties have had, de facto, similar "suburban" growth rates. Miami's suburban counties grew by over 200% from 1960-1980. During the 1980's, Orlando and Cincinnati had the highest suburban growth rates, with 73% and 66%, respectively. Most other localities with high suburban growth rates were in the metropolitan areas of the South and West.'

<sup>1</sup> As noted in Chapter 1, it is necessary to split the 1980-90 time period in order to account for geographic redefinition.

		1960			1970			1980	
Area	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	% c c	% SC	Areawide	% сс	% SC
New York City	15,125,552	11.23	88.77	16,694,775	9.22	90.78	15,795,751	9.04	90.96
Los Angeles	7,751,616	77.90	22.10	9,972,037	70.52	29.48	11,497,568	65.04	34.96
Chicago	6,895,076	74.40	25.60	7,730,231	71.05	28.95	7,869,542	66.76	33.24
San Francisco	3,638,939	20.34	79.66	4,628,199	15.46	84.54	5,179,784	13.11	86.89
Philadelphia	5,023,854	39.86	60.14	5,621,375	34.66	65.34	5,547,902	30.43	69.57
Detroit	4,122,160	64.68	35.32	4,665,493	57.16	42.84	4,618,161	50.62	49.38
Boston				3,526,349	18.18	81.82	3,448,122	16.33	83.67
Washington, DC	2,122,767	35.99	64.01	2,908,801	26.01	73.99	3,060,922	20.85	79.15
Dallas	1,737,960	54.75	45.25	2,377,979	55.82	44.18	2,974,805	52.32	47.68
Houston	1,570,758	79.14	20.86	2,169,128	80.30	19.70	3,101,293	77.69	22.31
Miami	1,268,993	73.68	26.32	1,887,892	67.15	32.85	2,643,981	61.49	38.51
Atlanta	1,169,047	47.59	52.41	1,597,816	38.03	61.97	2,029,710	29.06	70.94
Cleveland	2,732,350	60.31	39.69	3,000,276	57.37	42.63	2,834,062	52.87	47.13
Seattle	1,428,803	65.44	34.56	1,832,896	63.10	36.90	2,093,112	60.66	39.34
San Diego	1,033,011	100.00	0.00	1,357,854	100.00		1,861,846	100.00	
Minneapolis	1,597,815	52.75	47.25	1,965,159	48.86	51.14	2,113,533	44.54	55.46
St. Louis	2,144,205	34.98	65.02	2,410,163	25.82	74.18	2,356,460	19.23	80.77
Baltimore	1,803,745	52.06	47.94	2,070,670	43.74	56.26	2,174,023	36.19	63.81
Pittsburgh	2,405,435	67.70	32.30	2,401,245	66.84	33.16	2,263,894	64.05	35.95
Phoenix	663,510	100.00	0.00	967,522	100.00		1,509,052	100.00	
Tampa	809,238	49.16	50.84	1,088,549	45.04	54.96	1,569,134	41.23	58.77
Denver	934,884	52.83	47.17	1,237,208	41.60	58.40	1,620,902	30.38	69.62
Cincinnati	1,467,555	58.88	41.12	1,611,058	57.35	42.65	1,660,278	52.60	47.40
Milwaukee	1,420,631	72.95	27.05	1,574,526	66.94	33.06	1,570,275	61.45	38.55
Kansas City	1,108,620	56.17	43.83	1,271,515	51.48	48,52	1,327,106	47.42	52.58
Sacramento	625,503	80.38	19.62	800,592	78.88	21.12	1,014,002	77.26	22.74
Portland	821,897	63.61	36.39	1,009,127	55.16	44.84	1,242,594	45.28	54.72
Columbus	845,290	80.79	19.21	1,017,847	81.86	18.14	1,093,316	79.50	20.50
San Antonio	736,012	93.36	6.64	888,179	93.50	6.50	1,071,954	92.24	7.76
Indianapolis	1,070,294	65.18	34.82	1,248,333	63.47	36.53	1,305,911	58.60	41.40
New Orleans	907,123	69.18	30.82	1,045,809	56.75	43.25	1,187,073	46.97	53.03
Buffalo	1,306,957	81.46	18.54	1,349,211	82.53	17.47	1,242,826	81.71	18.29
Providence				1,075,107	16.67	83.33	1,096,092	14.31	85.69
Total	76,289,600	51.60	48.40	90,401,465	47.99	52.01	97430,772	45.78	54.22

 Table 3-1. Population (Areawide, Central and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980

	Percen	t Change 1960	) - 1970	Percent	Change 1970	- 1980	Percent	Change 1960	- 1980
Area	Areawide	сс	SC	Areawide	сс	SC	Areawide	сс	SC
New York City	10.37	-9.37	12.87	-5.39	-7.21	-5.20	4.43	-15.90	7.00
Los Angeles	28.64	16.45	71.64	15.30	6.33	36.74	48.32	23.82	134.70
Chicago	12.11	7.07	26.77	1.80	-4.35	16.89	14.13	2.42	48.18
San Francisco	27.19	-3.33	34.98	11.92	-5.13	15.04	42.34	-8.29	55.27
Philadelphia	11.89	-2.69	21.56	-1.31	-13.36	5.09	10.43	-15.70	27.75
Detroit	13.18	0.02	37.29	-1.01	-12.33	14.09	12.03	-12.32	56.63
Boston				-2.22	-12.18	-0.01			
Washington, DC	37.03	-0.97	58.40	5.23	-15.62	12.56	44.19	-16.44	78.29
Dallas	36.83	39.49	33.60	25.10	17.26	35.00	71.17	63.57	80.36
Houston	38.09	40.12	30.41	42.97	38.33	61.92	97.44	93.82	111.16
Miami	48.77	35.59	85.69	40.05	28.24	64.20	108.35	73.87	204.90
Atlanta	36.68	9.22	61.61	27.03	-2.91	45.40	73.62	6.04	134.99
Cleveland	9.81	4.45	17.94	-5.54	-12.95	4.43	3.72	-9.07	23.16
Seattle	28.28	23.70	36.95	14.20	9.78	21.75	46.49	35.80	66.74
San Diego	31.45	31.45		37.12	37.12		80.23	80.23	
Minneapolis	22.99	13.91	33.13	7.55	-1.94	16.62	32.28	11.69	55.26
St. Louis	12.40	-17.04	28.24	-2.23	-27.18	6.46	9.90	-39.59	36.52
Baltimore	14.80	-3.54	34.72	4.99	-13.14	19.09	20.53	-16.21	60.43
Pittsburgh	-0.17	-1.45	2.49	-5.72	-9.65	2.21	-5.88	-10.96	4.76
Phoenix	45.82	45.82		55.97	55.97		127.43	127.43	
Tampa	34.52	23.25	45.41	44.15	31.96	54.14	93.90	62.64	124.13
Denver	32.34	4.21	63.84	31.01	-4.34	56.19	73.38	-0.31	155.91
Cincinnati	9.78	6.93	13.86	3.06	-5.50	14.56	13.13	1.05	30.43
Milwaukee	10.83	1.71	35.43	-0.27	-8.45	16.30	10.53	-6.89	57.51
Kansas City	14.69	5.11	26.98	4.37	-3.86	13.11	19.71	1.05	43.62
Sacramento	27.99	25.60	37.78	26.66	24.05	36.39	62.11	55.81	87.92
Portland	22.78	6.48	51.28	23.14	1.07	50.28	51.19	7.62	127.35
Columbus	20.41	22.01	13.69	7.41	4.31	21.44	29.34	27.27	38.07
San Antonio	20.67	20.86	18.13	20.69	19.07	44.07	45.64	43.90	70.18
Indianapolis	16.63	13.58	22.35	4.61	-3.42	18.56	22.01	9.70	45.06
New Orleans	15.29	-5.43	61.78	13.51	-6.06	39.18	30.86	-11.16	125.17
Buffalo	3.23	4.58	-2.70	-7.88	-8.80	-3.55	-4.91	-4.62	-6.16
Providence				1.95	-12.50	4.84			
Total	18.50	10.20	27.35	7.78	2.82	12.35	27.71	13.31	43.07

Table 3-1. Population (Areawide, Central and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980 (Cont.)

		1980		1990 Percent Change 1980 - 19			990		
Area	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	% cc	% SC	Areawide	сс	SC
New York City	17,012,502	8.40	91.60	17,125,727	8.69	91.31	0.67	4.15	0.35
Los Angeles	11,497,568	65.04	34.96	14,531,529	60.99	39.01	26.39	18.53	41.00
Chicago	7,937,326	66.19	33.81	8,065,633	63.29	36.71	1.62	-2.83	10.32
San Francisco	5,360,925	12.67	87.33	6,253,311	11.58	88.42	16.65	6.63	18.10
Philadelphia	5,680,768	29.72	70.28	5,899,345	26.88	73.12	3.85	-6.08	8.05
Detroit	4,752,820	49.19	50.81	4,665,236	45.26	54.74	-1.84	-9.68	5.74
Boston	3,971,792	14.17	85.83	4,171,747	13.77	86.23	5.03	2.01	5.53
Washington, DC	3,250,822	19.64	80.36	3,923,574	15.47	84.53	20.69	-4.92	26.95
Dallas	2,930,516	53.11	46.89	3,885,415	47.69	52.31	32.58	19.05	47.92
Houston	3,101,293	77.69	22.31	3,711,043	75.94	24.06	19.66	16.96	29.07
Miami	2,643,981	61.49	38.51	3,192,582	60.67	39.33	20.75	19.15	23.30
Atlanta	2,138,231	27.59	72.41	2,833,511	22.90	77.10	32.52	10.01	41.09
Cleveland	2,834,062	52.87	47.13	2,759,823	51.17	48.83	-2.62	-5.76	0.90
Seattle	2,093,112	60.66	39.34	2,559,164	58.90	41.10	22.27	18.71	27.75
San Diego	1,861,846	100.00		2,498,016	100.00		34.17	34.17	
Minneapolis	2,137,133	44.05	55.95	2,464,124	41.90	58.10	15.30	9.67	19.73
St. Louis	2,376,998	19.06	80.94	2,444,099	16.23	83.77	2.82	-12.45	6.42
Baltimore	2,199,531	35.77	64.23	2,382,172	30.90	69.10	8.30	-6.45	16.52
Pittsburgh	2,423,311	59.84	40.16	2,242,798	59.59	40.41	-7.45	-7.84	-6.87
Phoenix	1,509,052	100.00		2,122,101	100.00		40.62	40.62	
Tampa	1,613,603	40.09	59.91	2,067,959	40.33	59.67	28.16	28.92	27.65
Denver	1,618,461	30.42	69.58	1,848,319	25.30	74.70	14.20	-5.03	22.61
Cincinnati	1,401,491	62.31	37.69	1,744,124	49.67	50,33	24.45	-0.80	66.18
Milwaukee	1,570,275	61.45	38.55	1,607,183	59.69	40.31	2.35	-0.59	7.04
Kansas City	1,433,458	43.90	56.10	1,566,280	40.43	59.57	9.27	0.63	16.02
Sacramento	1,099,814	71.23	28.77	1,481,102	70.30	29.70	34.67	32.91	39.01
Portland	1,490,153	37.76	62.24	1,477,895	39.51	60.49	-0.82	3.78	-3.61
Norfolk	1,160,311	23.01	76.99	1,396,107	18.71	81.29	20.32	-2.15	27.04
Columbus	1,243,833	69.88	30.12	1,377,419	69.80	30.20	10.74	10.62	11.02
San Antonio	1,071,954	92.24	7.76	1,302,099	91.04	8.96	21.47	19.88	40.35
Indianapolis	1,166,575	65.60	34.40	1,249,822	63.78	36.22	7.14	4.17	12.79
New Orleans	1,256,256	44.38	55.62	1,238,816	40.11	59.89	-1.39	-10.87	6.17
Buffalo	1,242,826	81.71	18.29	1,189,288	81.44	18.56	-4.31	-4.62	-2.90
Charlotte	971,391	41.62	58.38	1,162,093	44.01	55.99	19.63	26.5 1	14.73
Providence	1,083,139	14.48	85.52	1,141,525	14.08	85.92	5.39	2.50	5.88
Hartford	1,013,508	13.46	86.54	1,085,895	12.87	87.13	7.14	2.45	7.87
Orlando	700,055	67.28	32.72	1,072,748	63.15	36.85	53.24	43.84	72.57
Salt Lake City	910,222	68.01	31.99	1,012,227	67.71	32.29	17.80	17.27	18.93
Rochester	971,230	72.30	27.70	1,002,410	71.23	28.77	3.21	1.67	7.23
Total	110,732,144	43.28	56.72	123,814,261	42.27	57.73	11.81	9.22	13.79

 Table 3-1A. Population (Areawide, Central and Suburban Counties) 1980-1990

		Fastest Grow	ing Population	ns		
1960-19	70	1970-198	80	1980.1990		
Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	
Miami	48.8%	Phoenix	56.0%	Orlando	53.2%	
Los Angeles	48.3	Tampa	44.2	Phoenix	40.6	
Phoenix	45.8	Houston	43.0	Sacramento	34.7	
Houston	38.1	Miami	40.1	San Diego	34.2	
Washington, DC	37.0	San Diego	37.1	Dallas	32.6	
		Slowest Grow	ing Populatio	ns		
1960-19	70	1970-19	80	1980-1990		
Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	Metropolitan Area	Percent Change	
Pittsburgh	-0.2%	Buffalo	-7.9%	Pittsburgh	-7.5%	
Buffalo	3.2	Pittsburgh	-5.7	Buffalo	-4.3	
Cincinnati	9.8	Cleveland	-5.5	Cleveland	-2.6	
Cleveland	9.8	New York City	-5.4	Detroit	-1.8	
New York City	10.4	St. Louis	-2.2	New Orleans	-1.4	

Table 3-2. Fastest and Slowest Growing Metropolitan Areas, Percent Changes by Decade

Table 3-3.Fastest Growing Suburban Counties in Large U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1980 and<br/>1980-1990

1960-1	980	1980-1	990
Metropolitan	Percent	Metropolitan	Percent
Area	Change	Area	Change
Miami	204.9%	Orlando	<b>72.6%</b>
Denver	155.9	Cincinnati	<b>66.2</b>
Atlanta	135.0	Dallas	47.9
Los Angeles	134.7	Atlanta	41.1
Portland	127.4	Los Angeles	41.0

Figure 3-1 illustrates the relationship in 1990 between land area and population in central counties of the metropolitan areas. Only five areas have 50% or more of their total land area in central counties (San Diego, Phoenix, San Antonio, Buffalo, and Miami). In contrast, nineteen metropolitan areas have 50% or more of their total population in central counties. Thus, in most metropolitan areas, central counties still have a disproportionately high share of the total population, but a disproportionately low share of total land area. The data also suggest the higher population densities that exist in central counties compared to suburban counties.

Figure 3-2 shows the effects of the 1983 geographic change on population at the areawide level for the group of thirty-nine metropolitan areas. The two values for 1980 reflect the geographic revisions. As may be confirmed in Tables 3-1 and 3-1A, suburban counties accounted for most of the areawide growth, almost a 14% increase from 1980-1990, continuing the high rates established in the previous two decades.



#### Figure 3-2. Effect of 1983 Geographic Revision On Area Population

Viewing the entire thirty year period, many older metropolitan areas lost more than 20% of their central county population (Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, D.C., St. Louis, Baltimore, and New Orleans). Central counties with the highest growth rates are concentrated in the West and South. The central counties of five metropolitan areas grew by over 100% from 1960 to 1990. The rates, however, are somewhat overstated in metropolitan areas such as Phoenix and San Diego which are entirely central county. In the 1980's, only Orlando, Charlotte, Sacramento, and Tampa registered gains of 25% or better (excluding 100% central county areas).



Fourteen metropolitan areas had net decreases in central-county population during the 1960 to 1990 period (Table 3-4). St. Louis had the largest loss in central county population, a decline of 47.1%. Several others lost over twenty percent of central county populations. Generally, the 1970's appeared to mark the height of losses in central county populations (Figure 3-3). Indeed, twenty-one of the metropolitan areas had percent decreases during the 1970's. In the 1980's, however, central county populations grew in eight areas that had previously declined in the 1970's. These were New York City, San Francisco, Boston, Atlanta, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, and Providence. Without the influence of immigration, it is unlikely that Central County population would have increased in the 1980's. From 1980 to 1990 the central counties averaged only a 9.2% population increase, while the suburban counties averaged 13.8%.

Despite some increases in central counties populations during the 1980's, suburban populations are accounting for increasingly higher shares of overall area populations. During that time, thirty-three central counties had net losses in share of metropolitan area population (Table 3-5, Figure 3-4). The loss in central county share for seven metropolitan areas exceeded ten percent.

**Household Formation and Size.** From 1960-1990 the number of households in the U.S. increased nearly 75%, from 53 million to 92 million. Meanwhile, household size was declining. In 1960, the average U.S. household had 3.33 persons. The average household had 3.11 persons in 1970, 2.75 persons in 1980, and 2.63 persons in 1990. This represented a decline of over 20% during the thirty year period. The 1970-1980 period accounted for not only the largest percent increase in total households (26.7%), but also the largest percent decline in household size (11.58%). This pattern of more but smaller households seems firmly in place.

For the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, there was wide variation in 1990 in household size, ranging from 3.09 persons per household in Salt Lake City to 2.37 in Tampa. Most of these areas showed declines in households between 1980 and 1990. One exception to this trend should be noted. California's four large metropolitan areas (Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, and Sacramento) had increasing household size from 1980 to 1990. Los Angeles had the highest growth, increasing from 2.78 to 2.96 between 1980 and 1990, a 6.5% rise. In California, there are strong, local influences affecting demographic measures, such as new immigrant households and higher housing costs.

Figure 3-5 and Table 3-6 show demographic characteristics for persons per household, vehicles per household and workers per household. In this report, workers per household is calculated by dividing total workers by total households. Because total workers includes workers who live in group quarters and not in households, the number is slightly overstated. The largest discrepancy is in areas with high military and college dormitory group quarters population. While persons per household reflects very little variation among the metropolitan areas, vehicles per household and workers per household show wider variation due to differing costs of vehicle ownership, conditions that affect labor force participation, availability of transportation alternatives and other local conditions.

**Urban Populations.** The Census Bureau categorizes populations according to urban and rural. Urban populations include those living in officially designated "urbanized areas" (UZA's), plus those living in urban areas outside UZA's. Rural population includes rural farm and rural nonfat-m. From 1960 to 1990, the urban population of the United States rose from 54.1 million to 61.7 million, an increase of 49.3%. The largest increase was in the 1960's when urban population rose 19.5%. As a share of the total, urban population represented 69.9% in 1960, 73.6% in 1970, 73.7% in 1980, and 75.2% in 1990.

		Central Coun		Percent Change				
Area	1960	1970 I	<b>1980</b> I	1990	1960-70	1970-80	1980-90	1960-90
New York City	1,698,281	1,539,233	1,428,285	1,487,536	-9.37	-7.21	4.15	-12.41
los Angeles	6,038,771	7,032,075	7,477,503	8,863,164	16.45	6.33	18.53	46.77
Chicago	5,129,725	5,492,369	5,253,655	5,105,067	7.07	-4.35	-2.83	-0.48
San Francisco	740,316	715,674	678,974	723,959	-3.33	-5.13	6.63	-2.21
Philadelphia	2,002,512	1,948,609	1,688,210	1,585,577	-2.69	-13.36	-6.08	-20.82
Detroit	2,666,297	2,666,751	2,337,891	2,111,687	0.02	-12.33	-9.68	-20.80
Boston		641,071	562,994	574,283		-12.18	2.01	
Washington, DC	763,956	756,510	638,333	606,900	-0.97	-15.62	-4.92	-20.56
Dallas	951,527	1,327,321	1,556,390	1,852,810	39.49	17.26	19.05	94.72
Houston	1,243,158	1,741,912	2,409,547	2,818,199	40.12	38.33	16.96	126.70
Miami	935,047	1,267,792	1,625,781	1,937,094	35.59	28.24	19.15	107.17
Atlanta	556,326	607,592	589,904	648,951	9.22	-2.91	10.01	16.65
Cleveland	1,647,895	1,721,300	1,498,400	1,412,140	4.45	-12.95	-5.76	-14.31
Seattle	935,014	1,156,633	1,269,749	1,507,319	23.70	9.78	18.71	61.21
San Diego	1,033,011	1,357,854	1,861,846	2,498,016	31.45	37.12	34.17	141.82
Minneapolis	842,854	960,080	941,411	1,032,431	13.91	-1.94	9.67	22.49
St. Louis	750,026	622,236	453,085	396,685	-17.04	-27.18	-12.45	-47.11
Baltimore	939,024	905,759	786,775	736,014	-3.54	-13.14	-6.45	-21.62
Pittsburgh	1,628,587	1,605,016	1,450,085	1,336,449	-1.45	-9.65	-7.84	-17.94
Phoenix	663,510	967,522	1,509,052	2,122,101	45.82	55.97	40.62	219.83
Tampa	397,788	490,265	646,960	834,054	23.25	31.96	28.92	109.67
Denver	493,887	514,678	492,365	467,610	4.21	-4.34	-5.03	-5.32
Cincinnati	864,121	924,018	873,224	866,228	6.93	-5.50	-0.80	0.24
Milwaukee	1,036,341	1,054,063	964,988	959,275	1.71	-8.45	-0.59	-7.44
Kansas City	622,732	654,558	629,266	633,232	5.11	-3.86	0.63	1.69
Sacramento	502,778	631,498	783,381	1,041,219	25.60	24.05	32.91	107.09
Portland	522,813	556,667	562,640	583,887	6.48	1.07	3.78	11.68
Norfolk			266,979	261,229			-2.15	
Columbus	682,923	833,249	869,132	961,437	22.01	4.31	10.62	40.78
San Antonio	687,151	830,460	988,800	1,185,394	20.8	19.07	19.88	72.51
Indianapolis	697,567	792,299	765,233	797,159	13.5	-3.42	4.17	14.28
New Orleans	627,525	593,471	557,515	496,938	-5.43	-6.06	-10.87	-20.81
Buffalo	1,064,688	1,113,491	1,015,472	968,532	4.58	-8.80	-4.62	-9.03
Charlotte			404,270	511,433			26.51	
Providence		179,213	156,804	160,728		-12.50	2.50	
Hartford			136,392	139,739			2.45	
Orlando			471,016	677,49 1			43.84	
Salt Lake City			619,066	725,956			17.27	
Rochester			702,238	713,968			1.67	
Total	39,366,151	43580,955	44,603,852	48,577,064	10.20	2.82	8.91	23.40

 Table 3-4. Central County Population, 1960-1990



Figure 3-3. Changes in Central County Population 1960-1990

		1980			1990		% Change
Area	Areawide	Central County	%CC	Areawide	Central County	%CC	CC Share
New York City	17,012,502	1,428,285	8.40	17,125,727	1,487,536	8.69	3.46
Los Angeles	11,497,568	7,477,503	65.04	14,531,529	8,863,164	60.99	-6.22
Chicago	7,937,326	5,253,655	66.19	8,065,633	5,105,067	63.29	-4.37
San Francisco	5,360,925	678,974	12.67	6,253,311	723,959	11.58	-8.59
Philadelphia	5,680,768	1,688,210	29.72	5,899,345	1,585,577	26.88	-9.56
Detroit	4,752,820	2,337,891	49.19	4,665,236	2,111,687	45.26	-7.98
Boston	3,971,792	562,994	14.17	4,171,747	547,283	13.77	-2.88
Washington, DC	3,250,822	638,333	19.64	3,923,574	606,900	15.47	-21.23
Dallas	2,930,516	1,556,390	53.11	3,885,415	1,852,810	47.69	-10.21
Houston	3,101,293	2,409,547	77.69	3,711,043	2,818,199	75.94	-2.26
Miami	2,643,981	1,625,781	61.49	3,192,582	1,937,094	60.67	-1.33
Atlanta	2,138,231	589,904	27.59	2,833,511	648,951	22.90	-16.98
Cleveland	2,834,062	1,498,400	52.87	2,759,823	1,412,140	51.17	-3.22
Seattle	2,093,112	1,269,749	60.66	2,559,164	1,507,319	58.90	-2.91
San Diego	1,861,846	1,861,846	100.00	2,498,016	2,498,016	100.00	0.00
Minneapolis	2,137,133	941,411	44.05	2,464,124	1,032,431	41.90	-4.88
St. Louis	2,376,998	453,085	19.06	2,444,099	396,685	16.23	-14.85
Baltimore	2,199,531	786,775	35.77	2,382,172	736,014	30.90	-13.62
Pittsburgh	2,423,311	1,450,085	59.84	2,242,798	1,336,449	59.59	-0.42
Phoenix	1,509,052	1,509,052	100.00	2,122,101	2,122,101	100.00	0.00
Tampa	1,613,603	646,960	40.09	2,067,959	834,054	40.33	0.59
Denver	1,618,461	492,365	30.42	1,848,319	467,610	25.30	-16.84
Cincinnati	1,401,491	873,224	62.31	1,744,124	866,228	49.67	-20.29
Milwaukee	1,570,275	964,988	61.45	1,607,183	959,275	59.69	-2.87
Kansas City	1,433,458	629,266	43.90	1,566,280	633,232	40.43	-7.90
Sacramento	1,099,814,1,	783,381	71.23	1,481,102	1,041,219	70.30	-1.30
Portland	490,153	562,640	37.76	1,477,895	583,887	39.51	4.64
Norfolk	1,160,311	266,979	23.01	1,396,107	261,229	18.71	-18.68
Columbus	1,243,833	869,132	69.88	1,377,419	961,437	69.80	-0.11
San Antonio	1,071,954	988,800	92.24	1,302,099	1,185,394	91.04	-1.31
Indianapolis	1,166,575	765,233	65.60	1,249,822	797,159	63.78	-2.77
New Orleans	1,256,256	557,515	44.38	1,238,816	496,938	40.11	-9.61
Buffalo	1,242,826	1,015,472	81,71	1,189,288	968,532	81.44	-0.33
Charlotte	971,391	404,270	41.62	1,162,093	511,433	44.01	5.75
Providence	1,083,139	156,804	14.48	1,141,525	160,728	14.08	-2.74
Hartford	1,013,508	136,392	13.46	1,085,895	139,735	12.87	-4.31
Orlando	700,055	471,016	67.28	1,072,748	677,491	63.15	-6.14
Salt Lake City	910,222	619,066	68.01	1,072,227	725,956	67.71	-0.43
Rochester	971,230	702,238	72.30	1,002,410	713,968	71.23	-1.45
Total	110,732,144	47,923,611	43.28	123,814,261	52,341,891	42.27	-2.32

## Table 3-3. Relationship of Central County to Areawide Population, 1980-1990



Figure 3-4. Central County Share of Area Population - Percent Change 1980-1990



Figure 3-5. 1990 Household Ratios

In the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, urban and rural population for 1990 are displayed in Table 3-6. The Miami metropolitan area had the highest percentage of population (98.9%) classified as urban, while Charlotte showed the fewest (68.7%) people living in urban areas. The average for the entire group of large metropolitan areas was 91.6%, compared to 75.2% for the U.S. as a whole. In sum, the data depict a country with an increasingly urban population, and large metropolitan areas that are now overwhelmingly urban.

**Household Income.** Table 3-7 shows 1990 data for household income. The top five areas for median household income are Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Hartford, Boston, and New York. Thus, while Sunbelt regions have the highest rates of population growth, the older Northeastern metropolitan areas continue to have the highest household incomes. This may be due to the combination of higher local wages and more workers per household. In Washington, D.C., over 20% of the households had 1990 incomes of \$75,000 or more. At the lower end of the group are New Orleans, Tampa, San Antonio and Pittsburgh. In New Orleans, over 30% of households earned less than \$15,000. In 1990, the median household income in Washington, D.C. was \$46,856, while the median household income in New Orleans was \$24,442.

Trip volume and mode choice decisions reflect household income levels and geographic location of income groups. Workers in certain economically sensitive industries and occupations may display different commuting patterns than those in more stable industries. Lower incomes mean fewer vehicles available per household, and thus fewer drive alone commute trips.



Metro- politan Area	Persons Per Household	Vehicles Per Household	Workers Per Household*	Percent Urban Population	Percent Rural Population
NYC	2.67	1. 20	1.29	95. 7%	4.3%
LOS	2. 91	1.74	1.39	97.4%	2.6%
CHI	2.72	1.49	1.32	<b>96.0%</b>	4.0%
SFC	2.61	1. 73	1.37	<b>96.</b> 1%	3.9%
PHI	2.66	1. 49	1.30	<b>89.0</b> %	11.0%
DET	2.67	1.66	1.21	<b>88.</b> 4%	11.6%
BOS	2.61	1.54	1.39	87.1%	12.9%
WAS	2. 62	1.67	1.52	91.5%	8.5%
DAL	2.64	1.74	1.36	92.6%	7.4%
HOU	2.75	1.65	1.32	89. 7%	10. 3%
MIA	2.58	1.49	1.21	<b>98. 9%</b>	1.1%
ATL	2.64	1.80	1.40	<b>80. 9</b> %	19.1%
CLE	2.56	1.62	1.17	90.1%	9. 9%
SEA	2.49	1.81	1.30	<b>89. 9</b> %	10.1%
SDG	2.69	1.75	1.39	95.2%	4.8%
MIN	2.58	1.74	1.40	<b>89. 9</b> %	10.1%
STL	2.59	1.66	1.24	<b>87.9</b> %	12.1%
BAL	2.64	1.57	1.35	87.2%	<b>12. 8</b> %
PIT	2.46	1.45	1.07	<b>80. 9</b> %	19.1%
PHX	2. 59	1.65	1.23	<b>96.4%</b>	3.6%
TAM	2. 32	1.52	1.05	<b>89. 2%</b>	<b>10.8</b> %
DEN	2.46	1.77	1.31	<b>94. 2%</b>	<b>5.8</b> %
CIN	2.61	1.69	1.25	85.1%	<b>14. 9%</b>
MIL	2.61	1.59	1.28	<b>89.6</b> %	10.4%
KSC	2.55	1.72	1.28	<b>89. 2%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
SAC	2.60	1.78	1.23	<b>87.9</b> %	<b>12.</b> 1%
POR	2. 52	1.75	1.26	<b>84.</b> 7%	15.3%
NFK	2.69	1.68	1.41	<b>94.8</b> %	5.2%
COL	2.54	1.71	1.29	<b>80. 9</b> %	<b>19.</b> 1%
SAT	2.82	1.63	1.26	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>8.8</b> %
IND	2.56	1.71	1.30	82.7%	17.3%
NRL	2.67	1.41	1.13	<b>93. 2%</b>	<b>6.8</b> %
BUF	2. 51	1.47	1.15	85.4%	<b>14.6</b> %
CHA	2.58	1.80	1.37	<b>68.</b> 7%	31.3%
PRO	2.57	1.30	1.27	<b>87.</b> 1%	<b>12.9</b> %
HAR	2.56	1.72	1.37	<b>80.</b> 3%	<b>19.</b> 7%
ORL	2.60	1.71	1.38	<b>90.</b> 3%	9.7%
SLC	3.04	1.88	1.38	<b>98.4%</b>	1.6%
ROC	2.58	1.64	1.28	<b>70.6%</b>	29.4%

 Table 3-6. Demographic Ratios and Urban/Rural Population Percentages, 1990

\*Total workers divided by total households. Total workers includes workers who live in group quarters.

			<b>Income Intervals in \$ Thousands</b>							
Metro- politan	Median Household		\$15	\$30-	\$50-					
Area	Income	< \$15	\$29.9	\$49.9	\$74.9	\$75+				
NYC	<b>\$37.869</b>	20. 3%	19.4%	23. 4%	<b>18.8</b> %	<b>18.</b> 1%				
LOS	36. 711	18.5%	21.7%	25.2%	18.7%	15.9%				
CHI	35, 916	19.1%	21.9%	27.1%	18.9%	13.1%				
SFC	41, 459	15.1%	<b>19.3%</b>	25. 5%	21.2%	<b>18.9%</b>				
PHI	35, 735	<b>19. 5%</b>	<b>21.9%</b>	<b>26.8</b> %	<b>18.8%</b>	13.0%				
DET	34, 729	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>25.8</b> %	<b>18. 7%</b>	12.3%				
BOS	40, 647	17.5%	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>24. 9%</b>	21.3%	<b>17.8%</b>				
WAS	46, 856	<b>10.4%</b>	17.2%	<b>25.9%</b>	23. 7%	22.7%				
DAL	32, 825	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>26.8</b> %	<b>16. 9%</b>	11.3%				
HOU	31, <b>488</b>	<b>22.</b> 3%	<b>25.0%</b>	25.2%	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>11.2%</b>				
MIA	28, 503	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>26.</b> 1%	<b>24.0%</b>	14. 1%	<b>9.8</b> %				
ATL	36, 051	17.2%	23.1%	<b>27.8</b> %	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>				
CLE	30, 332	24.0%	25.4%	<b>26.8</b> %	15.3%	<b>8.</b> 5%				
SEA	35, 047	17.4%	24.2%	<b>29.</b> 1%	<b>18.4%</b>	10.9%				
SDG	35, 022	17.9%	24.3%	<b>26.</b> 7%	<b>18. 2%</b>	12.9%				
MIN	36, 564	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>22.8</b> %	<b>29.</b> 5%	<b>19. 7%</b>	11.4%				
STL	31, 706	<b>21.9%</b>	<b>24.</b> 7%	27.7%	<b>16. 7%</b>	9.0%				
BAL	36, 550	<b>18. 2%</b>	<b>21.8</b> %	27.3%	<b>19. 5%</b>	13.1%				
PIT	26, 501	<b>28.</b> 2%	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>24.</b> 7%	12.6%	<b>7.0%</b>				
PI-IX	30, 797	21.1%	27.3%	<b>27.0%</b>	15.3%	<b>9. 2%</b>				
TAM	26, 036	<b>26.</b> 3%	<b>30.8</b> %	<b>24. 9%</b>	11.5%	6.5%				
DEN	<b>33, 126</b>	<b>19.</b> 5%	25.0%	27.4%	17.4%	<b>10. 7%</b>				
CIN	30, 979	<b>23. 1%</b>	25.2%	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>8.8</b> %				
MIL	32, 359	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>24.</b> 5%	<b>28.</b> 7%	17.1%	8.4%				
KSC	<b>31, 948</b>	<b>20. 9%</b>	25.9%	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>8.</b> 7%				
SAC	32, 734	20. 2%	<b>24. 9%</b>	27.0%	17.7%	10.2%				
POR	31, 070	20.8%	27.1%	<b>28.</b> 5%	15.4%	8.2%				
NFK	30, 841	20.1%	<b>28.</b> 2%	<b>28.8</b> %	15.7%	7.2%				
COL	30, 668	22.0%	<b>26.</b> 7%	27.9%	15.3%	8.1%				
SAT	26, 092	27.8%	28.8%	24. 5%	12.3%	6.6%				
IND	31,655	20.4%	26.5%	27.9%	16.5%	8.7%				
NKL	24, 442	32.7%	26.1%	22.7%	11.8%	<b>6.</b> 7%				
BUE	28, U84	26.8%	Z <b>6.</b> 1%	<b>ZU. 4%</b>	14.0%	<b>6.</b> 7%				
CHA	31, 126	21.2%	26.6%	27.9%	15.9%	8.4%				
PKO	31,857	23.5%	23.3%	27.4%	16.7%	9.2%				
HAK	41, 440	15.0%	19.1%	26.7%	22.8%	16.3%				
UKL	31, 230	19. 2%	<b>Zð. 3%</b>	<b>28.</b> 4%	15.6%	<b>8.</b> 5%				
SLC	3 <b>0, 882</b>	19.7%	<b>28.4%</b>	29. 8%	15.1%	<b>6.9%</b>				
ROC	34, 234	19. <b>8</b> %	<b>Z3. 4</b> %	27.9%	<b>18.</b> 5%	10.4%				

 

 Table 3-7. Median Household Income and Percent of Households in Income Intervals, Thirty-Nine Metropolitan Areas, 1990

## Chapter 4

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK TRIP: WORKER RESIDENCES, PLACES OF WORK, COMMUTER FLOWS, AND TRAVEL TIMES

This chapter describes the characteristics of workers. It includes discussion and tables on the growth of workers, residential and workplace location based on central/suburban county definitions, male/female distributions, and the effects of commuting flows and travel times. New data on time leaving home to go to work are also discussed.

#### **Characteristics of Workers**

The biggest change in commuting behavior over the last thirty years is in the dramatic increase in women's participation in the labor force. Another major change is the development of "reverse" commuting (residents in central cities who work in the suburbs), and commuting between suburbs.

In 1990, the U.S. had 115 million workers or approximately 46.3% of the population in the workforce. In the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, there was a slightly greater proportion (49.1%) of workers to total population. In 1960, when there were 64.7 million workers in the U.S., only 36.1% of the population was working. Much of the increase during the past thirty years can be accounted for by the increase in women's participation in the labor force, rising from 32.3% of all workers in 1960 to 45.3% of all workers in 1990.

Because the geographic scale of analysis in this report is limited to counties, we cannot fully explore suburban development, reverse commuting, and suburb-to-suburb commuting. The county level analysis in this report shows major increases in commuting from the central county to suburban counties, and in one suburban county to other suburban counties. Table 4-1 below compares worker characteristics between the U.S. and the thirty-nine metropolitan areas,

	U.S.		Metropolitan	
Item	Totals	Percent	Areas	Percent
Population	248,709,873	100.0%	123,814,261	100.0%
Total Workers	1 15,070,274	44.3%	59,704,401	46.3%
Worked In County				
of Residence	87,587,677	76.1%	43,233,668	72.4%
Worked Outside				
County of Residence	23,488,393	20.4%	14,016,809	23.5%
Worked Out of State	3,994,204	3.5%	2,377,625	4.0%

$1 a \mu c = 1$ , worker Comparisons, 0.5, and $1 \mu c = 1 \mu c \mu$	Table 4-l. V	Vorker Con	parisons, U.S	5. and Thirty	y-Nine Metro	politan Areas,	1990
--	--------------	------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	----------------	------

**Growth in the Number of Workers.** Over the 1960- 1990 period, total workers grew by nearly 78%. As a share of the total U.S. population, workers increased from 36.1% in 1960 to 46.3% in 1990, resulting in a total rise in this ratio of about 24%. Nationwide, the number of workers sixteen and older

increased sharply in the 1980-1990 period, both in absolute figures and as a percentage of the total population. Total workers rose by over 19%, from 42.6% in 1980 to 46.3% in 1990, more than twice the growth of the total population.

The growth in workers was driven by three main factors. First, was the sheer demographics of the baby boomers entering the labor force. Second, was the general increase in the number of workers per household. Third, was a significant increase in the number of women in the work force. In 1990, the U.S. work force was over 46% female.

Among the thirty-nine large metropolitan areas, each successive decade from 1960 to 1990 produced an average growth rate of 22% in the number of workers. Considerable variation is found across metropolitan areas. These data are presented in Tables 4-2 and 4-2A. In the 1980-1990 period, for example, the change in the number of workers ranged from a high of over 71% in Orlando to a 0.7% decline in Pittsburgh. While much of this activity reflects the differing rates of population growth between Sunbelt areas and more northerly areas, some northern areas such as New York City and Philadelphia have rising number of workers despite a fairly static overall total population.

**The Rise in Workers to Total Population.** In the 1960-1990 period, the number of U.S. workers increased at twice the rate of the total population. There were 64.7 million workers in 1960 (36.1% of the population), and 115 million workers in 1990 (46.3% of the population). The growth rate of workers continued unabated in the 1980's, following trends established in the 1960's and 1970's.

Figure 4-1 compares the percent of workers to total population for large metropolitan areas during the 1960-1990 period. Each decade has produced a steadily higher proportion of workers to population, led in 1990 by Washington, DC. with over 55%. The area with the lowest proportion of workers to population was New Orleans with about 42%. Metropolitan areas at the lower (right hand) tail of Figure 4-1 may be areas with large manufacturing sectors or with higher than average retirement populations.

Between 1960 and 1980, the metropolitan areas with the highest growth rates of workers as a percent of the population were in Houston, Minneapolis and Denver (Tables 4-3 and 4-3A). Between 1980 and 1990, the leaders in this category were Tampa, Philadelphia and Atlanta. In Houston and Dallas, where energy related unemployment occurred, there was little change in the proportion of workers to population in the last decade.

**The Male/Female Distribution of Workers.** The total increase in workers is due in large part to the rising proportion of women in the labor force during the last thirty years. In the U.S., women as a percentage of all workers have grown from 33.2% in 1960 to almost 45.3% in 1990. Recent data show a compound annual growth rate of almost 3% for female workers, almost twice the male worker rate.' Parity between the number of male workers and female workers may be developing in the 1990's. Among large metropolitan areas, the highest percentages of female workers in 1990 are in Boston (47.4%), Washington, D.C. (47.5%), and Providence (47.4%). The highest percentages of male workers are in San Diego (58.3%) Norfolk (58.0%) and Los Angeles (57.1%), largely attributable to the effects of near by military bases. The complete list of male and female labor force percentages from 1960 - 1990 is outlined in Figure 4-2 and Tables 4-4 and 4-4A.

<sup>1</sup>Hu, P.S, and Young, J. "Summary of Travel Trends, 1990 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey" (U.S. DOT/FHWA, March 1992).



Figure 4-1. Percent Workers to Total Population, 1960-1990

		1960		1970			1980		
Area	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	% сс	% SC
New York City	5,886,760	13.28	86.72	6,559,153	10.46	89.54	6,737,511	10.09	89.91
Los Angeles	2,944,496	79.62	20.38	3,821,341	72.17	27.83	5,189,055	65.14	34.86
Chicago	2,674,645	77.32	22.68	3,089,717	71.64	28.36	3,466,377	65.80	34.20
San Francisco	1,397,515	24.09	75.91	1,824,464	17.47	82.53	2,482,965	13.44	86.56
Philadelphia	1,881,353	41.33	58.67	2,178,519	34.06	65.94	2,327,057	26.09	73.91
Detroit	1,424,586	65.41	34.59	1,698,646	56.72	43.28	1,836,510	45.89	54.11
Boston				1,424,038			1,614,734		
Washington, DC	869,632	39.65	60.35	1,256,081	26.70	73.30	1,559,820	18.94	81.06
Dallas	677,200	56.74	43.26	985,683	57.11	42.89	1,469,079	53.94	46.06
Houston	570,562	80.89	19.11	855,427	82.10	17.90	1,508,211	79.55	20.45
Miami	470,475	75.75	24.25	725,677	69.50	30.50	1,153,080	63.17	36.83
Atlanta	443,766	49.17	50.83	660,013	38.14	61.86	950,030	26.52	73.48
Cleveland	1,009,058	62.37	37.63	1,147,050	59.07	40.93	1,203,817	53.14	46.86
Seattle	533,270	67.35	32.65	703,300	64.13	35.87	976,885	63.79	36.21
San Diego	405,497	100.00		544,348	100.00		853,666	100.00	
Minneapolis	604,622	55.23	44.77	796,965	51.33	48.67	1,046,229	46.49	53.51
St. Louis	781,822	36.68	63.32	899,598	25.00	75.00	1,004,504	16.86	83.14
Baltimore	676,742	52.54	47.46	819,597	42.07	57.93	968,908	30.54	69.46
Pittsburgh	813,897	69.52	30.48	853,151	67.89	32.11	912,880	65.88	34.12
Phoenix	233,880	100.00		365,896	100.00		658,854	100.00	
Tampa	266,229	53.53	46.47	367,266	50.73	49.27	608,999	46.30	53.70
Denver	357,363	55.24	44.76	497,057	42.55	57.45	808,019	30.12	69.88
Cincinnati	522,756	60.52	39.48	595,683	58.38	41.62	692,424	53.68	46.32
Milwaukee	542,220	74.78	25.22	627,231	68.36	31.64	720,308	60.72	39.28
Kansas City	425,361	58.24	41.76	521,912	52.66	47.34	620,092	46.97	53.03
Sacramento	230,925	81.38	18.62	293,180	80.02	19.98	435,089	78.42	21.58
Portland	304,381	65.53	34.47	393,331	56.23	43.77	568,916	45.91	54.09
Columbus	311,896	82.49	17.51	395,826	82.99	17.01	488,303	81.10	18.90
San Antonio	259,785	93.48	6.52	329,203	93.40	6.60	449,090	92.24	7.76
Indianapolis	411,416	66.69	33.31	489,625	64.81	35.19	577,759	60.23	39.77
New Orleans	309,237	71.44	28.56	363,821	56.59	43.41	484,155	44.29	55.71
Buffalo	466,984	81.45	18.55	495,141	82.70	17.30	499,842	81.64	18.36
Providence				442,722	16.43	83.57	486,604	13.21	86.79
Total	28,708,331	53.11	46.89	37,020,662	46.41	51.17	45,359,772	44.19	54.19

# Table 4-2. Workers by Place of Residence(Areawide, Central, and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980

	Percent Change 1960 - 1970			Percent Change 1970 - 1980			Percent Change 1960 - 1980		
Area	Areawide	сс	SC	Areawide	CC	SC	Areawide	CC	SC
New York City	11.42	-12.23	15.04	2.72	-0.96	3.15	14.45	-13.07	18.67
Los Angeles	29.78	17.63	77.25	35.79	22.57	70.08	76.23	44.17	201.47
Chicago	15.52	7.04	44.44	12.19	3.04	35.31	29.60	10.29	95.44
San Francisco	30.55	-5.30	41.93	36.09	4.71	42.74	77.67	-0.84	102.58
Philadelphia	15.80	-4.60	30.16	6.82	-18.18	19.73	23.69	-21.94	55.84
Detroit	19.24	3.39	49.21	8.12	-12.52	35.16	28.92	-9.56	101.68
Boston				13.39		18.85			
Washington, DC	44.44	-2.75	75.44	24.18	-11.91	37.33	79.37	-14.33	140.92
Dallas	45.55	46.5 1	44.29	49.04	40.76	60.07	116.93	106.23	130.97
Houston	49.93	52.17	40.45	76.31	70.84	101.41	164.34	159.96	182.89
Miami	54.24	41.53	93.96	58.90	44.43	91.86	145.09	104.41	272.14
Atlanta	48.73	15.35	81.02	43.94	0.11	70.96	114.08	15.48	209.48
Cleveland	13.68	7.65	23.66	4.95	-5.59	20.16	19.30	1.63	48.59
Seattle	31.88	25.58	44.90	38.90	38.16	40.22	83.19	73.50	103.17
San Diego	34.24	34.24		56.82	56.82		110.52	110.52	
Minneapolis	31.81	22.50	43.30	31.28	18.89	44.34	73.04	45.64	106.83
St. Louis	15.06	-21.57	36.29	11.66	-24.67	23.77	28.48	-40.92	68.69
Baltimore	21.11	-3.03	47.84	18.22	-14.19	41.75	43.17	-16.79	109.55
Pittsburgh	4.82	2.31	10.43	7.00	3.83	13.70	12.16	6.29	25.55
Phoenix	56.45	56.45		80.07	80.07		181.71	181.71	
Tampa	37.95	30.74	46.26	65.82	51.35	80.72	128.75	97.87	164.3 1
Denver	39.09	7.14	78.52	62.56	15.08	97.73	126.11	23.29	252.98
Cincinnati	13.95	9.93	20.12	16.24	6.87	29.38	32.46	17.48	55.41
Milwaukee	15.68	5.75	45.12	14.84	2.01	42.56	32.84	7.87	106.88
Kansas City	22.70	10.94	39.11	18.81	5.96	33.10	45.78	17.55	85.16
Sacramento	26.96	24.83	36.26	48.40	45.44	60.27	88.41	81.56	118.38
Portland	29.22	10.87	64.12	44.64	18.09	78.74	86.91	30.93	193.35
Columbus	26.9 1	27.68	23.29	23.36	20.55	37.07	56.56	53.92	68.99
San Antonio	26.72	26.62	28.22	36.42	34.72	60.5 1	72.87	70.57	105.81
Indianapolis	19.01	15.65	25.73	18.00	9.67	33.33	40.43	26.84	67.64
New Orleans	17.65	-6.80	78.81	33.08	4.13	70.81	56.56	-2.94	205.42
Buffalo	6.03	7.67	-1.16	0.95	-0.35	7.17	7.04	7.29	5.93
Providence				9.91	-11.65	14.15			
Total	28.95	12.68	40.75	22.53	16.66	29.75	58.00	31.45	82.62

Table 4-2. Workers by Place of Residence(Areawide, Central, and Suburban Counties) 1960-1980 (Cont.)



Figure 4-2. Male/Female Worker Ratios, 1960-1990

	1980			1990			Percent Change 1980 - 1990		
Area	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	% сс	% SC	Areawide	сс	SC
New York City	7,248,643	9.38	90.62	8,057,252	9.36	90.64	11.16	10.97	11.17
Los Angeles	5,189,055	65.14	34.86	6,809,043	60.44	39.56	31.22	21.75	48.91
Chicago	3,496,988	65.23	34.77	3,841,337	61.69	38.31	9.85	3.89	21.03
San Francisco	2,564,593	13.01	86.99	3,200,833	11.94	88.06	24.81	14.55	26.34
Philadelphia	2,378,301	25.52	14.48	2,794,917	22.92	77.08	17.52	5.52	21.63
Detroit	1,887,578	44.65	55.35	2,079,880	39.55	60.45	10.19	-2.40	20.34
Boston				2,141,717	13.19	86.81		12.91	
Washington, DC	1,646,632	17.94	82.06	2,214,350	13.75	86.25	34.48	3.06	41.35
Dallas	1,450,908	54.61	45.39	1,976,606	47.72	52.28	36.23	19.02	56.94
Houston	1,508,211	79.55	20.45	1,759,796	77.07	22.93	16.68	13.04	30.84
Miami	1,153,080	63.17	36.83	1,476,085	60.16	39.84	28.01	21.91	38.49
Atlanta	995,028	25.32	74.68	1,481,781	21.28	78.72	48.92	25.16	56.98
Cleveland	1,206,817	53.00	47.00	1,242,099	49.72	50.28	2.92	-3.46	10.12
Seattle	976,885	63.79	36.21	1,308,338	61.59	38.41	33.93	29.30	42.08
San Diego	853,666	100.00		1,230,446	100.00		44.14	44.14	
Minneapolis	1,055,726	46.07	53.93	1,307,624	42.91	57.09	23.86	15.37	31.12
St. Louis	1,012,460	16.73	83.27	1,144,336	13.85	86.15	13.03	-6.44	16.94
Baltimore	979,973	30.19	69.81	1,191,813	25.82	74.18	21.62	3.98	29.24
Pittsburgh	963,336	62.43	37.57	956,154	62.27	37.73	-0.75	-1.00	-0.33
Phoenix	658,854	100.00		996,495	100.00		51.25	51.25	
Tampa	622,490	45.30	54.70	914,711	44.93	55.07	46.94	45.74	47.94
Denver	806,904	30.16	69.84	964,912	23.99	76.01	19.58	-4.88	30.15
Cincinnati	587,898	63.22	36.78	812,766	49.14	50.86	38.25	7.46	91.17
Milwaukee	720,308	60.72	39.28	772,752	56.87	43.13	7.28	0.48	17.79
Kansas City	663,211	43.91	56.09	771,309	39.52	60.48	16.30	4.68	25.40
Sacramento	471,851	72.31	27.69	685,945	70.31	29.69	45.37	41.36	55.85
Portland	670,458	38.95	61.05	724,532	39.56	60.44	8.07	9.74	7.00
Norfolk	531,647	24.06	75.94	698,999	18.68	81.32	31.48	2.06	40.80
Columbus	550,284	71.97	28.03	677,859	71.89	28.11	23.18	23.05	23.54
San Antonio	449,090	92.24	7.76	569,149	90.77	9.23	26.73	24.72	50.68
Indianapolis	523,549	66.41	33.53	624,971	63.46	36.54	19.37	13.96	30.10
New Orleans	510,747	41.98	58.02	514,726	36.32	63.68	0.78	-12.82	10.62
Buffalo	499,842	81.64	18.36	531,122	81.50	18.50	6.26	6.08	7.04
Charlotte	472,188	42.94	57.06	604,856	45.83	54.17	28.10	36.74	21.59
Providence				544,668	12.25	87.75		3.19	
Hartford				561,969	9.84	90.16		0.97	
Orlando	324,943	69.13	30.87	557,448	63.91	36.09	71.55	58.61	100.53
Salt Lake City	384,078	69.40	30.60	479,338	68.69	31.31	24.80	23.51	27.72
Rochester	427,779	74.03	25.97	481,467	72.09	27.91	12.55	9.60	20.95
Total	46.444.001	44.93	55.07	56,456,047	42.83	57.17	21.56	15.87	26.19

 Table 4-2A. Workers by Place of Residence (Areawide, Central, and Suburban Counties) 1980-1990

	Workers (% of population)			Percent Change			
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960-70	1970-80	1960-80	
New York City	38.9	39.3	42.7	0.9	8.6	9.6	
Los Angeles	38.0	38.3	45.1	0.9	17.8	18.8	
Chicago	38.8	40.0	44.0	3.0	10.2	13.6	
San Francisco	38.4	39.4	47.9	2.6	21.6	24.8	
Philadelphia	37.4	38.8	41.9	3.5	8.2	12.0	
Detroit	34.6	36.4	39.8	5.4	9.2	15.1	
Boston		40.4	46.8		16.0		
Washington, DC	41.0	43.2	51.0	5.4	18.0	24.4	
Dallas	39.0	41.5	49.4	6.4	19.1	26.7	
Houston	36.3	39.4	48.6	8.6	23.3	33.9	
Miami	37.1	38.4	43.6	3.1	13.5	17.6	
Atlanta	38.0	41.3	46.8	8.8	13.3	23.3	
Cleveland	36.9	38.2	42.5	3.5	11.1	15.0	
Seattle	37.3	38.4	46.7	2.8	21.6	25.0	
San Diego	39.3	40.1	45.9	2.1	14.4	16.8	
Minneapolis	37.8	40.6	49.5	7.2	22.1	30.8	
St. Louis	36.5	37.3	42.6	2.4	14.2	16.9	
Baltimore	37.5	39.6	44.6	5.5	12.6	18.8	
Pittsburgh	33.8	35.5	40.3	5.0	13.5	19.2	
Phoenix	35.2	37.8	43.7	7.3	15.4	23.9	
Tampa	32.9	33.7	38.8	2.6	15.0	18.0	
Denver	38.2	40.2	49.8	5.1	24.1	30.4	
Cincinnati	35.6	37.0	41.7	3.8	12.8	17.1	
Milwaukee	38.2	39.8	45.9	4.4	15.2	20.2	
Kansas City	38.4	41.0	46.7	7.0	13.8	21.8	
Sacramento	36.9	36.6	42.9	-0.8	17.2	16.2	
Portland	37.0	39.0	45.8	5.2	17.5	23.6	
Columbus	36.9	38.9	44.7	5.4	14.8	21.0	
San Antonio	35.3	37.1	41.9	5.0	13.0	18.7	
Indianapolis	38.4	39.2	44.2	2.0	12.8	15.1	
New Orleans	34.1	34.8	40.8	2.0	17.2	19.6	
Buffalo	35.7	36.7	40.2	2.7	9.6	12.6	
Providence		41.2	44.4		7.8		
Total	37.6	39.0	44.5	3.6	14.1	18.2	

Table 4-3. Workers As a Percent of Population, 1960-1980
	Wor (% of po	kers pulation)	Percent Change
	1980	1990	1980-90
Area			
New York City	42.6	47.0	10.4
Los Angeles	45.1	46.9	3.8
Chicago	44.1	47.6	8.1
San Francisco	47.8	51.2	7.0
Philadelphia	41.9	47.4	13.2
Detroit	39.7	44.6	12.3
Boston		51.3	
Washington, DC	50.7	56.4	11.4
Dallas	49.5	50.9	2.8
Houston	48.6	47.4	-2.5
Miami	43.6	46.2	6.0
Atlanta	46.5	52.3	12.4
Cleveland	42.6	45.0	5.7
Seattle	46.7	51.1	9.5
San Diego	45.9	49.3	7.4
Minneapolis	49.4	53.1	7.4
St. Louis	42.6	46.8	9.9
Baltimore	44.6	50.0	12.3
Pittsburgh	39.8	42.6	7.2
Phoenix	43.7	47.0	7.6
Tampa	38.6	44.2	14.7
Denver	49.9	52.2	4.7
Cincinnati	41.9	46.6	11.1
Milwaukee	45.9	48.1	4.8
Kansas City	46.3	49.2	6.4
Sacramento	42.9	46.3	7.9
Portland	45.0	49.0	9.0
Norfolk	45.8	50.1	9.3
Columbus	44.2	49.2	11.2
San Antonio	41.9	43.7	4.3
Indianapolis	44.9	50.0	11.4
New Orleans	40.7	41.5	2.2
Buffalo	40.2	44.7	11.0
Charlotte	48.6	52.0	7.1
Providence		47.7	
Hartford		51.8	
Orlando	46.4	52.0	12.0
Salt Lake City	42.2	44.7	5.9
Rochester	44.0	48.0	9.0
Total	44.37	48.08	8 36

Table 4-3A. Workers As a Percent of Population, 1980-1990

	Mal	e (%of worl	cers)	Female (% of workers		
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960	1970	1980
New York City	65.6	61.3	56.4	34.4	38.7	43.6
Los Angeles	66.3	61.9	57.8	33.7	38.1	42.2
Chicago	66.9	62.0	57.2	33.2	38.0	42.8
San Francisco	65.9	61.6	56.6	34.1	38.4	43.4
Philadelphia	66.4	62.1	57.4	33.6	38.0	42.6
Detroit	69.5	64.4	58.1	30.5	35.6	42.0
Boston		59.4	55.0		40.6	45.0
Washington, DC	60.6	57.4	54.2	39.4	42.5	45.8
Dallas	63.1	61.1	57.1	36.9	38.9	42.9
Houston	68.3	64.0	59.6	31.7	36.0	40.4
Miami	64.2	59.5	55.9	35.8	40.6	44.1
Atlanta	63.8	60.2	55.8	36.2	39.8	44.2
Cleveland	68.4	63.5	57.9	31.6	36.5	42.1
Seattle	64.7	62.7	58.6	35.3	37.3	41.4
San Diego	67.0	61.7	61.6	33.0	38.3	38.4
Minneapolis	64.7	60.0	55.1	35.3	40.0	44.9
St. Louis	66.9	61.8	56.6	33.1	38.2	43.4
Baltimore	66.4	61.5	56.9	33.6	38.5	43.1
Pittsburgh	71.2	66.0	59.8	28.8	34.0	40.2
Phoenix	68.7	61.6	58.2	31.3	38.4	41.8
Tampa	64.9	60.1	56.1	35.1	39.9	43.9
Denver	65.6	60.7	57.0	34.4	39.3	43.0
Cincinnati	68.1	63.4	58.1	31.9	36.6	41.9
Milwaukee	67.4	61.4	56.3	32.6	38.6	43.7
Kansas City	64.9	60.3	55.9	35.1	39.7	44.1
Sacramento	67.2	61.5	56.5	32.8	38.5	43.5
Portland	45.5	61.3	57.2	34.5	38.7	42.8
Columbus	65.7	60.5	56.2	34.3	39.5	43.8
San Antonio	66.0	60.9	59.1	34.0	39.1	40.9
Indianapolis	66.0	61.8	56.5	34.1	38.3	43.5
New Orleans	66.3	62.8	58.9	33.7	37.2	41.1
Buffalo	69.0	63.1	57.6	31.0	36.9	42.4
Providence		59.0	55.2		41.0	44.8

Table 4-4. Workers by Gender, 1960-1980

	Male (% of workers)		Female (% of workers)		
Area	1980	1990	1980	1990	
New York City	56.4	53.8	43.6	46.2	
Los Angeles	57.8	57.1	42.2	42.9	
Chicago	57.2	54.5	42.8	45.5	
San Francisco	56.6	55.0	43.4	45.0	
Philadelphia	57.4	53.4	42.6	46.6	
Detroit	58.1	54.4	42.0	45.6	
Boston	55.0	52.6	45.0	47.4	
Washington, DC	54.2	52.5	45.8	47.5	
Dallas	57.1	54.9	42.9	45.1	
Houston	59.6	56.6	40.4	43.4	
Miami	55.9	54.1	44.1	45.9	
Atlanta	55.8	53.3	44.2	46.7	
Cleveland	57.9	53.8	42.1	46.2	
Seattle	58.6	55.2	41.4	44.8	
San Diego	61.6	58.3	38.4	41.7	
Minneapolis	55.1	52.7	44.9	47.3	
St. Louis	56.6	53.2	43.4	46.8	
Baltimore	56.9	53.4	43.1	46.6	
Pittsburgh	59.8	54.1	40.2	45.9	
Phoenix	58.2	55.2	41.8	44.8	
Tampa	56.1	53.2	43.9	46.8	
Denver	57.0	53.7	43.0	46.3	
Cincinnati	58.1	53.6	41.9	46.4	
Milwaukee	56.3	53.1	43.7	46.9	
Kansas City	55.9	52.9	44.1	47.1	
Sacramento	56.5	54.0	43.5	46.0	
Portland	57.2	54.8	42.8	45.2	
Norfolk		58.0		42.0	
Columbus	56.2	53.4	43.8	46.6	
San Antonio	59.1	54.9	40.9	45.1	
Indianapolis	56.5	53.1	43.5	46.9	
New Orleans	58.9	53.6	41.1	46.4	
Buffalo	57.6	53.1	42.4	46.9	
Charlotte		53.5		46.5	
Providence	55.2	52.6	44.8	47.4	
Hartford		52.7		47.3	
Orlando		54.8		45.2	
Salt Lake City		55.4	ļ	44.6	
Rochester		53.2		46.8	

 Table 4-4A. Workers by Gender, 1980-1990

**Workers per Household and Workers per Family.** The U.S. has become a country of households and families with multiple workers. For this report, workers per household is calculated using total workers divided by total households. This ratio does not account for the fact that some workers are not in households, particularly in military group quarters. Thus the figures for Norfolk, San Diego and Los Angeles are somewhat inflated using this method of calculation. The definition of workers per family, however is taken directly from Summary Tape File 3. Families, by census definition, have at least two persons and who are related by birth, marriage or adoption.

From 1960-1990, workers per household showed only a slight growth at a national level, climbing only 2.6%. In 1960, the ratio was 1.22, and in 1990 it was 1.25. Although household size was getting smaller, more members of households were working. In the 1980's, workers per household in the US. grew by 4.2%. It is possible that the thirty year trend toward smaller households may be reaching its lower limits.

Table 4-5 lists workers per household for the large metropolitan areas and reflects a large degree of variability between those areas. Households in Washington, D.C. and Norfolk, for example, each had an average of over 1.4 workers, while households in Tampa, Pittsburgh, and New Orleans had fewer than 1.15 workers in 1990. Although Tampa, with 1.05 workers per household defined the low end of the range, it was the fastest growing area in terms of workers per household, rising 11.0% in the 1980's. In eight metropolitan areas, workers per household declined from 1980 to 1990. The biggest drop was in Houston, where this ratio fell from 1.38 in 1980 to 1.32 in 1990.

Changes in workers per household varies widely relative to total population in the metropolitan areas. Houston's population grew by 19.7% from 1980 to 1990, but the number of workers per household declined by 4%. A similar pattern took place in San Antonio. In contrast, New York City's population rose by just 0.7% in the 1980's, although workers per household grew by 8.6%. Philadelphia and Detroit exhibited changes comparable to those in New York City. During the 1980 to 1990 period, the older, northern metropolitan areas experienced a resurgence of workers. This was due to the changing nature of the workforce; service sector employment, the increase in female workers, and the maturation of the baby boomers.

Figure 4-3 depicts multiple worker families in 1990. For most of the thirty-nine areas, over 40% of all families have two workers per family, ranging from nearly 55% in Minneapolis to around 39% in Pittsburgh. The percentage of families with three or more workers hovers around 15% nationwide, reaching nearly 20% in Boston, and falling to a low of 10% in Tampa.



Figure 4-3. Workers Per Family - Percentage Distribustions (1989 Data)

Metropolitan Area	1980	1990	Metropolitan Area	1980	1990
Washington, DC	1.41	1.52	Columbus	1.22	1.29
Norfolk	1.38	1.42	New York City	1.18	1.29
Atlanta	1.30	1.40	Rochester	1.25	1.29
Minneapolis	1.37	1.40	Milwaukee	1.29	1.28
Los Angeles	1.26	1.39	Kansas City	1.25	1.28
Orlando	1.29	1.39	San Antonio	1.30	1.26
San Diego	1.27	1.39	Portland	1.19	1.26
Salt Lake City	1.33	1.38	Cincinnati	1.18	1.24
San Francisco	1.26	1.37	St. Louis	1.20	1.24
Charlotte	1.38	1.37	Phoenix	1.21	1.23
Dallas	1.37	1.36	Sacramento	1.13	1.23
Baltimore	1.28	1.35	Miami	1.12	1.21
Houston	1.38	1.32	Detroit	1.15	1.21
Chicago	1.26	1.32	Cleveland	1.18	1.17
Denver	1.33	1.31	Buffalo	1.12	1.15
Seattle	1.23	1.31	New Orleans	1.16	1.13
Indianapolis	1.25	1.30	Pittsburgh	1.09	1.07
Philadelphia	1.21	1.30	Tampa	0.95	1.05

Table 4-5. Workers per Household\*, 1980 and 1990, for Large Metropolitan Areas.

\* Total workers divided by total households. Total workers includes workers who live in group quarters.

(Sorted by 1990 number and based on 1983 geography. New England areas excluded )

## Workers by Place of Residence and Place of Work

Two primary concepts are used in the discussion of place of work and place of residence:

**Central/Suburban County:** For these tables and figures, each worker has a residence in either a central county or a suburban county. Likewise, each worker has a work location in either a central county or a suburban county. The flows between these types of counties is discussed.

**Same/Different County:** For these tables and figures, it does not matter whether the county of work or residence is considered the central county or the suburban county. The distinguishing characteristic is whether or not it is the same or different. Therefore, living and working in a central county is classified the same as living and working in one suburban county. Similarly, living in a central county and working in a suburban county is classified the same as living and working in a suburban county and working in a suburban county.

An important caveat when considering counties is the variation in the number of counties comprising a given metropolitan area. For example, New York, with the largest metropolitan area population has twenty-three counties, but Los Angeles with the second largest metropolitan population has only five. Phoenix, with a population of 2.1 million, and San Diego, 2.5 million, constitute only one county each. (See Chapter Three for a detailed discussion of counties.)

During the 1960-1990 period, the proportion of U.S. workers who worked in their county of residence showed little variation. Central county workers tended to live in the central county. Suburban county workers tended to work in the suburban county of residence. In 1960, 81.7% of workers were employed in their county of residence. For the remaining years, the percentages were 74% in 1970, 72.5% in 1980, and 76.1% in 1990. Table 4-6 below indicates that the biggest change was the shift in residences from central counties to suburban counties. In 1960, about 46.8% of workers in large metropolitan areas lived in suburban counties. By 1990, the percentage of workers living in suburban counties was around 57.2%, having steadily increased in each preceding decade.

Residence of Workers	1960	1970	1980	1990
Areawide	29.033.438	37.416.482	46.444.001	56.456.047
Central County	15,444,704	18,310,716	21,016,490	24,180,355
Percent	(53.2%)	(48.9%)	(45.3%)	(42.8%)
Suburban County	13,588,734	19,105,766	24,760,108	32,275,692
Percent	(46.8%)	(51.1%)	(54.7%)	(57.2%)

#### Table 4-6. Workers by County of Residence, Large Metropolitan Areas, 1960-1990.

Suburban counties continue to make rapid gains as both a work location and a residence location. Several metropolitan areas (St. Louis, Baltimore, Denver, Detroit, Norfolk) had over 30% of their central county residents commute to suburban jobs. Increases in suburban county jobs were most evident in high-growth, Sunbelt metropolitan areas such as Orlando, Dallas, and San Antonio. During the 1980's, the thirty year trend toward suburban county employment showed some indication of slowing in certain areas. Older, northern, metropolitan areas like New York, Philadelphia, Washington, DC., and Baltimore registered increases in the absolute number of workers employed in central counties during the 1980's, after two decades of decline (Table 4-7).

**Workers Living in Central Counties.** Tables 4-8 and 4-8A describe the work location of central county residents for 1980 and 1990. Among large metropolitan areas, about 90% of workers who live in the central county, also work there. Metropolitan areas with high percentages of central county residents who also work in the central county include Rochester, San Antonio, Houston, and Columbus, each with over 95% in 1990. Because Phoenix and San Diego metropolitan areas include only one county which by definition is the central county, nearly all of the working residents work in the central county.

In contrast, in St. Louis, Denver and Baltimore over 30% of central county residents commute to the suburban counties. In Washington, D.C., almost 10% of the central county residents work out of the area entirely, the highest rate among the metropolitan areas. Figure 4-4 graphs these relationships for workers who also lived in their central county in 1990.



	<b>Central County Workers</b>			Percent Change				
Area	1960	1970	1980	1990	1960-70	1970-80	1980-90	1960-90
New York City	781,756	686,176	679,599	754,148	-12.23	-0.96	10.97	-3.53
Los Angeles	2,344,440	2,757,759	3,380,069	4,115,248	17.63	22.57	21.75	75.53
Chicago	2,068,110	2,213,608	2,280,950	2,369,624	7.04	3.04	3.89	14.58
San Francisco	336,596	318,741	333,762	382,309	-5.30	4.71	14.55	13.58
Philadelphia	777,655	741,907	607,053	640,577	-4.60	-18.18	5.52	-17.63
Detroit	931,881	963,470	842,838	822,620	3.39	-12.52	-2.40	-11.72
Boston			250,233	282,528			12.91	
Washington, DC	344,812	335,344	295,399	304,428	-2.75	-11.91	3.06	-11.71
Dallas	384,228	562,942	792,396	943,146	46.51	40.76	19.02	145.4
Houston	461,520	702,278	1,199,746	1,356,196	52.17	70.84	13.04	193.85
Miami	356,364	504,345	728,43 1	887,996	41.53	44.43	21.91	149.18
Atlanta	218,209	251,707	251,980	315,366	15.35	0.11	25.16	44.52
Cleveland	629,398	677,570	639,668	617,552	7.65	-5.59	-3.46	-1.88
Seattle	359,182	451,053	623,184	805.782	25.58	38.16	29.30	124.34
San Diego	405,497	544,348	853,666	1,230,446	34.24	56.82	44.14	203.44
Minneapolis	333,928	409,062	486,349	561,081	22.50	18.89	15.37	68.02
St. Louis	286,762	224,899	169,408	158,499	-21.57	-24.67	-6.44	-44.73
Baltimore	355,576	344,801	295,890	307,679	-3.03	-14.19	3.98	-13.47
Pittsburgh	565,811	579,196	601,403	595,405	2.37	3.83	-1.00	5.23
Phoenix	233,880	365,896	658,854	996,495	56.45	80.07	51.25	326.07
Tampa	142,500	186,303	281,968	410.950	30.74	51.35	45.74	188.3
Denver	197,401	211,494	243,383	231,503	7.14	15.08	-4.88	17.28
Cincinnati	316,363	347,766	371,673	399,406	9.93	6.87	7.46	26.2
Milwaukee	405,446	428,746	437,352	439,449	5.75	2.01	0.48	8.3
Kansas City	247,75 1	274,846	291,235	304,852	10.94	5.96	4.68	23.0
Sacramento	187,932	234,599	341,201	482,321	24.83	45.44	41.36	156.6
Portland	199,472	221,156	261.164	286,600	10.87	18.09	9.74	43.68
Norfolk			127,920	130,549			2.06	
Columbus	257,295	328,510	396,033	487,305	27.68	20.55	23.05	89.4
San Antonio	242,842	307,478	414,219	516,606	26.62	34.72	24.72	112.7
Indianapolis	274,358	317,303	347,999	396,584	15.65	9.67	13.96	44.5
New Orleans	220,919	205,903	214,415	186,926	-6.80	4.13	-12.82	-15.3
Buffalo	380,339	409.500	408,061	432,883	7.67	-0.35	6.08	13.8
Charlotte			202,735	277.227			36.74	
Providence		72,738	64,266	66,699		-11.65	3.79	
Hartford			54,756	55,289			0.97	
Orlando			224,619	356,271			58.61	
Salt Lake City			266,558	329,238			23.51	
Rochester			3 16,680	347,088			9.60	
Total	15,248,223	17,108,706	19,729,348	22,739,982	12.20	15.32	15.26	49.1

Table 4-7. Central County Workers, 1960-1990

	Work in Cen	tral County	Work in Suburban County		Work Out	t of Area
Area	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New York City	505,693	84.23	82,871	13.80	11,811	1.97
Los Angeles	2,924,845	95.91	27,474	0.90	97,369	3.19
Chicago	1,933,512	94.38	104,391	5.10	10,817	0.53
San Francisco	252,407	85.57	40,529	13.74	2,045	0.69
Philadelphia	473,938	85.65	73,75 1	13.33	5,631	1.02
Detroit	641,125	83.34	121,359	15.78	6,790	0.88
Washington, DC	205,743	80.87	44,974	17.68	3,693	1.45
Dallas	682,496	95.11	27,474	3.83	7,601	1.06
Houston	1,019,368	96.98	19,977	1.90	11.742	1.12
Miami	611,109	96.26	15,733	2.48	8,018	1.26
Atlanta	176,276	78.02	46,29 1	20.49	3,374	1.49
Cleveland	561,749	95.05	24,570	4.16	4,677	0.79
Seattle	547,374	94.70	22,682	3.92	7,981	1.38
San Diego	744,771	94.21			45,733	5.79
Minneapolis	400,397	87.80	51,429	11.28	4,207	0.92
St. Louis	113,431	75.57	35,859	23.89	817	0.54
Baltimore	196,995	75.95	55,129	21.26	7,234	2.79
Pittsburgh	532,784	94.45	19,167	3.40	12,135	2.15
Phoenix	585,761	98.59			8,387	1.41
Tampa	235,129	92.36	9,105	3.58	10,346	4.06
Denver	165,485	74.92	53,166	24.07	2,222	1.01
Cincinnati	323,275	93.48	18,188	5.26	4,378	1.27
Milwaukee	371,533	91.89	28,844	7.13	3,939	0.97
Kansas City	221,365	83.47	40,259	15.18	3,584	1.35
Sacramento	283,100	92.28	13,860	4.52	9,821	3.20
Portland	206,326	87.61	25,689	10.91	3,493	1.48
Columbus	348,448	96.33	5,724	1.58	7,564	2.09
San Antonio	373,156	97.91	1,601	0.42	6,367	1.67
Indianapolis	307,666	95.13	12,117	3.75	3,638	1.12
New Orleans	156,213	82.73	26,320	13.94	6,300	3.34
Buffalo	365,715	95.31	11,763	3.07	6,219	1.62
Total	16467,185	92.23	1,060,296	5.94	327,933	1.84

 Table 4-8. Place of Work, Workers Living in Central Counties, 1980

Area	Work in Centra	al County	Work in Suburban County		Work Out	of Area
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New York City	635,761	84.30	107,817	14.30	10,570	1.40
Los Angeles	3,872,310	94.10	206,638	5.02	36,300	0.88
Chicago	2,147,598	90.63	204,259	8.62	17,767	0.75
San Francisco	307,400	80.41	71,702	18.75	3,207	0.84
Philadelphia	513,167	80.11	118,025	18.42	9,385	1.47
Detroit	633,415	77.00	182,086	22.13	7,119	0.87
Boston	226,723	69.95	92,254	28.46	5,132	1.58
Washington, DC	236,734	77.76	44,995	14.78	22,699	7.46
Dallas	855,094	90.66	71,105	7.54	16,947	1.80
Houston	1,294,782	95.47	42,132	3.11	19,282	1.42
Miami	844,722	95.13	31,561	3.55	11.713	1.32
Atlanta	221,309	70.18	88,685	28.12	5,372	1.70
Cleveland	573,657	92.89	35,678	5.78	8,217	1.33
Seattle	750,970	93.20	42,780	5.31	12,032	1.49
San Diego	1,187,997	96.55			42,449	3.45
Minneapolis	478,582	85.30	75,997	13.54	6,502	1.16
St. Louis	104.181	65.73	53,065	33.48	1,253	0.79
Baltimore	203,387	66.10	92,320	30.01	11,972	3.89
Pittsburgh	555,766	93.34	23,204	3.90	16,435	2.76
Phoenix	977,648	98.11			18,847	1.89
Tampa	373,741	90.95	20,980	5.11	16,229	3.95
Denver	156,628	67.66	71,838	31.03	3,037	1.31
Cincinnati	356,399	89.23	35,336	8.85	7,671	1.92
Milwaukee	378,890	86.22	54,012	12.29	6,547	1.49
Kansas City	242,909	79.68	57,688	18.92	4,255	1.40
Sacramento	424,777	88.07	36,800	7.63	20,744	4.30
Portland	231,766	80.87	50,270	17.54	4,564	1.59
Norfolk	100,821	77.23	26,260	20.12	3,468	2.66
Columbus	464,102	95.24	14,617	3.00	8,586	1.76
San Antonio	502,381	97.25	2,990	0.58	11,235	2.17
Indianapolis	363,631	91.69	24,902	6.28	8,051	2.03
New Orleans	151,738	81.18	30,524	16.33	4,664	2.50
Buffalo	409,439	94.58	12,976	3.00	10,468	2.42
Charlotte	258,943	93.40	11,456	4.13	6,828	2.46
Providence	214,207	77.50	24,660	8.92	37,538	13.58
Hartford	391,507	90.45	14,298	3.30	27,03 1	6.25
Orlando	3 17.493	89.12	27,822	7.81	10,956	3.08
Salt Lake City	306,533	93.10	11,823	3.59	10,882	3.31
Rochester	335,539	96.67	7,204	2.08	4,345	1.25
Total	22 602 647	89.64	2 120 759	8 41	/00 200	1 0/

Table 4-8A. Place of Work, Workers Living in Central Counties, 1990

\*\* Boston, Providence, and Hartford county flows are based on the (NECMA) New England County Metropolitan Area.

**Workers Living in Suburban Counties.** The picture is more complicated for workers who reside in suburban counties (Tables 4-9 and 4-9A, Figure 4-5). The Indianapolis and Houston metropolitan areas showed increases of over 40% of such workers in 1990, compared to similar rates in 1980 of 33.5% and 37.1% respectively. Altogether, eleven large metropolitan areas had higher rates of commuting to the central counties in 1990 than in 1980. Some of the factors related to these figures are the relative size (square miles) of the central county to the suburban counties and the spatial configuration of the suburban counties relative to other suburban counties in the metropolitan area.

Compared to the central counties there is a smaller concentration of suburban county residents who work in the same suburban county. The greatest concentrations in this category are located in Tampa and Miami each having over 80% in 1980 and 1990. Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Buffalo also had large numbers of workers who lived and worked in the same suburban county. In the Atlanta and Washington, DC. metropolitan areas, less than 50% of suburban county residents worked in the same suburban county.

Of those suburban county residents who work in a different suburban county, the highest numbers are in New York, Norfolk and Atlanta, each with over 23% in 1990. In contrast, in both 1980 and 1990 Seattle had less than 1% of its suburban workers commuting to other suburban counties within the metropolitan area. Comparing 1980 and 1990 data for this category of workers, there has been relatively strong growth among many of the metropolitan areas. The same applies for those suburban residence workers who work outside the metropolitan area. In 1990, the Baltimore and Washington, D.C. areas each had over 13% of suburban county workers in the "out of area" category. Thus, the new OMB definition for 1992 combines them in one metropolitan area.

**Jobs to Workers in Central Counties.** Figure 4-6 illustrates the number of jobs in central counties of metropolitan areas compared to the number of workers who live in the central county. In 1990, thirty-four of the thirty-nine areas had more jobs than workers in their central counties. This measure gives a snapshot of the possible daytime instability of vehicles versus population in these areas. It also suggests the degree of congestion that could exist due to the influx of workers commuting to central counties. In four metropolitan areas, central county jobs outnumber workers by more than 1.7:1, New York being the highest at 2.65:1. Washington, D.C., St. Louis, and Atlanta also ranked high by this measure.

Except those metropolitan areas that are entirely designated as central counties, the lowest ratios of jobs to workers were in Providence (0.97:1), San Antonio (1:1), and Sacramento (1:1). Those metropolitan areas at the lower part of the graph may suggest a greater decentralization of jobs. There may be an inverse relationship between the geographic size of central counties and their ratio of jobs to workers. Metropolitan areas with less than 10% of their total land area in central counties have the highest ratios of jobs to workers. Smaller land areas often imply higher concentrations of jobs and workers. Central county land areas were discussed in Chapter 3.

## **Commuter Flows and Travel Times**

*Intracounty and Intercounty Commuting Trends.* The last thirty years have seen a change in both residential and job locations across the metropolitan region. In the period from 1960 to 1980, there were substantial and significant increases in the number of workers who lived in one county and worked in another county (about 100% for the total of metropolitan areas). In the same period, there were more modest increases (35%) in the number of workers who lived and worked in the same county.



Figure 4-5. Workers Residing in Suburban Counties - Work Location - 1990



	Work Central (	cin County	Work in Suburban	<b>Same</b> County	Work in Suburban	Other County	Work ( of Ar	Dut ea
Area	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New York City	1,192,898	21.86	2,999,651	54.97	1,154,901	21.17	108,955	2.00
Los Angeles	276,669	16.99	1,261,956	77.49	71,702	4.40	18,227	1.12
Chicago	274,462	25.28	710,274	65.42	78,124	7.20	22,878	2.11
San Francisco	198,938	10.38	1,449,169	75.58	247,733	12.92	21,545	1.12
Philadelphia	215,863	13.62	1,031,327	65.06	263,874	16.65	74,213	4.68
Detroit	185,821	19.85	626,402	66.90	105,023	11.22	19,056	2.04
Washington, DC	352,817	30.27	496,310	42.58	267,925	22.98	48,620	4.17
Dallas	144,754	23.41	431,468	69.78	29,567	4.78	12,498	2.02
Houston	91,123	33.46	168,246	61.78	7,153	2.63	5,807	2.13
Miami	49,275	13.07	309,985	82.20			17,866	4.74
Atlanta	222,284	34.38	293,251	45.35	114,871	17.77	16,194	2.50
Cleveland	108,253	20.61	369,086	70.28	32,087	6.11	15,762	3.00
Seattle	74,641	22.92	240,388	73.82	621	0.19	9,994	3.07
San Diego								
Minneapolis	127,650	24.32	290,447	55.33	96,609	18.40	10,271	1.96
St. Louis	192,461	24.96	475,648	61.70	88,502	11.48	14,317	1.86
Baltimore	180,964	29.29	303,294	49.09	65,321	10.57	68,225	11.04
Pittsburgh	69,793	23.84	198,944	67.97	5,730	1.96	18,244	6.23
Phoenix								
Tampa	19,516	6.58	263,246	88.76	6,718	2.27	7,098	2.39
Denver	188,606	36.17	250,550	48.05	71,499	13.71	10,831	2.08
Cincinnati	108,255	36.13	147,808	49.34	28,878	9.64	14,659	4.89
Milwaukee	76,809	29.26	167,422	63.79	9,584	3.65	8,658	3.30
Kansas City	88,210	29.33	157,726	52.45	47,667	15.85	7,109	2.36
Sacramento	22,087	25.61	57,473	66.64	717	0.83	5,968	6.92
Portland	99,626	35.61	159,202	56.90	12,621	4.51	8,335	2.98
Columbus	27,592	32.03	52,055	60.43	1,482	1.72	5,006	5.81
San Antonio	9,312	28.93	18,895	58.71	1,486	4.62	2,493	7.75
Indianapolis	79,135	37.13	116,088	54.47	8,173	3.84	9,717	4.56
New Orleans	78,060	32.75	136,908	57.44	6,075	2.55	17,298	7.26
Buffalo	15,454	17.81	69,884	80.54			1,430	1.65
Total	4,771,328	22.24	13,253,103	61.79	2,824,643	13.17	601,274	2.80

 Table 4-9. Place of Work, Workers Living in Suburban Counties, 1980

	Work Central	c in County	Work in Suburban	Same County	Work in Suburban	Other County	Work of Ar	Out ea
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percont
Area	Tuniber	rereent	Tuniber	rereent	TAULIDEL	I ei teit	TAUIIDEI	rercent
New York City	1,365,191	18.69	3,988,507	54.61	1,791,553	24.53	157,853	2.16
Los Angeles	429,013	15.93	2,040,222	75.74	181,485	6.74	43,075	1.60
Chicago	387,5 11	26.33	873,424	59.35	176,537	12.00	34,241	2.33
San Francisco	248,517	8.82	2,052,514	72.82	477,222	16.93	40,27 1	1.43
Philadelphia	234,111	10.87	1,350,985	62.71	447,094	20.75	122,150	5.67
Detroit	209,255	16.64	8 19,579	65.19	185,552	14.76	42,874	3.41
Boston	266,276	16.58	1,021,793	63.63	237,584	14.79	80,201	4.99
Washington, DC	446,455	23.38	912,392	47.77	267,722	14.02	283,353	14.84
Dallas	279,039	27.00	663,887	64.24	69,256	6.70	21,278	2.06
Houston	162,270	40.21	220,094	54.53	10,350	2.56	10,886	2.70
Miami	77,285	13.14	471,595	80.19			39,209	6.67
Atlanta	323,566	27.74	534,609	45.83	276,403	23.70	31,837	2.73
Cleveland	144,477	23.13	405,163	64.87	49,534	7.93	25,373	4.06
Seattle	138,379	27.54	345,428	68.73	2,894	0.58	15,855	3.15
San Diego								
Minneapolis	207,045	27.73	367,161	49.18	156,352	20.94	15,985	2.14
St. Louis	203,701	20.66	593,596	60.21	167,976	17.04	20,564	2.09
Baltimore	179,085	20.26	452,126	51.14	135,012	15.27	117,911	13.34
Pittsburgh	87,279	24.19	230,05 1	63.77	17,409	4.83	26,010	7.21
Phoenix								
Tampa	49,923	9.91	413,211	82.03	27,438	5.45	13,189	2.62
Denver	209,722	28.60	37 1,624	50.67	135,601	18.49	16,462	2.24
Cincinnati	144,442	34.94	190,523	46.09	52,487	12.70	25,908	6.27
Milwaukee	92,738	27.82	205,271	61.59	19,411	5.82	15,883	4.77
Kansas City	116,732	25.03	254,347	54.53	83,376	17.87	12,002	2.57
Sacramento	58,235	28.60	122,931	60.37	18,589	9.13	3,869	1.90
Portland	133,489	30.48	253,203	57.82	36,139	8.25	15,101	3.45
Norfolk	104,279	18.34	299,730	52.73	135,903	23.91	28,538	5.02
Columbus	71,586	37.57	102,667	53.88	6,113	3.21	10,188	5.35
San Antonio	14,777	28.12	28,938	55.07	4,073	7.75	4,755	9.05
Indianapolis	107,226	46.95	99,684	43.65	9,779	4.28	11,698	5.12
New Orleans	92,600	28.25	189,364	57.77	28,430	8.67	17,406	5.31
Buffalo	24,279	24.71	71,347	72.63			2,613	2.66
Charlotte	72,408	22.10	213,698	65.23	21,771	6.65	19,752	6.03
Providence	45,372	28.42	81,281	50.91	11,999	1.52	21,014	13.16
Hartford	54,117	36.72	70,870	48.08	1,067	0.72	21,339	14.48
Orlando	90,104	44.79	100,792	50.10	1,911	0.95	8,370	4.16
Salt Lake City	27,761	18.50	93,869	62.54	23,574	15.71	4,896	3.26
Rochester	43,043	32.03	75,567	56.23	6,092	4.53	9,677	7.20
Total	6.941.288	20.30	20.582.043	60.20	5.273.688	15.43	1.391.586	4.07

 Table 4-9A. Place of Work, Workers Living in Suburban Counties, 1990

\*\* Boston, Providence, and Hartford county flows are based on the (NECMA) New England County Metropolitan Area.

The trend reversed itself in the 1980's, partly due to the growth of jobs in the suburban counties. Many areas, formerly "bedroom communities," have developed as regional employment centers. Between 1980 and 1990, the number of workers who lived and worked in the same county increased by over 30% for the total of metropolitan areas. The number of workers who lived in one county and worked in another county only increased by 7% overall. For example, in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, there was a 78% increase in intercounty commuting between 1970 and 1980, and a 10% decrease in intercounty commuting between 1970 and 1980, and a 10% decrease in intercounty commuting between 1980 and 1990. These figures and trends are displayed in Tables 4-10 through 4- 1 1A and Figures 4-7 and 4-8.

Commuting Flows. Table 4-12 shows the regional share of five types of county to county commuter flows for 1980, 1990, and the change in the proportion of shares between 1980 and 1990.<sup>2</sup> The five types of flows are:

Central County to Central County Central County to Suburban County Suburban County to Central County Suburban County to Same Suburban County Suburban County to Other Suburban County (in the same metropolitan area)

It does not, however, reveal the total number for each type of commute, and out of area commutes are omitted from the table. For the actual numbers, please refer to Tables 4-8, 4-8A, 4-9 and 4-9A, keeping in mind that different geographies are reported for 1980 and 1990.

Figure 4-9 shows the percentage distribution of these five types of commute flows for 1990. It is evident from Figure 4-9 that Central County to Central County (CC-CC) and Suburban County to Same Suburban County (SC-Same) trips make up the majority of workers' origin to destination trips in the thirtynine metropolitan areas in 1990. Thus, while the category Suburban County to Other Suburban County (SC-Other SC) trips had the largest increase in share in the 1980's, they make up less than 10% of all trips in metropolitan areas. How county lines are drawn makes the greatest difference in how the distribution among the five categories appears in these tables. If areas such as Phoenix and San Diego had their existing land areas divided into central and suburban counties, we might find significant Suburban County to Suburban County (SC-SC) flows there also.

In 1980, twelve of the thirty-one metropolitan areas had more than 60% of the flows in the CC-CC category. By 1990, only nine of the same thirty-one areas met this proportion of flows. This includes San Diego and Phoenix.

Fourteen of the thirty-one metropolitan areas in this table showed declines of 5% or more in the relative share in CC-CC commuting flows. In fact, all of the thirty-one metropolitan areas except Indianapolis (1.28%) and Buffalo (.02%) showed decreases in the proportion of CC-CC flows. Concurrently, SC-Same SC commute flows showed increases, particularly in Washington, DC., Baltimore, Denver, Kansas City, Portland, and New Orleans. Washington, D.C. had by far the greatest increase (11.5%) in SC-Same SC commute flow, indicating rapid employment development in the suburban counties in the 1980's.

<sup>2</sup> The three New England metropolitan areas are not included in this analysis, nor are the six new metropolitan areas included as a result of the 1983 geographic revisions.









Figure 4-9. Commuter Flows - Percent Distribution, 1990

	Workers Livin	ving and Working in Same County		Pe	Percent Change		
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960-70	1970-80	1960-80	
New York City	3,354,274	3,365,626	3,505,344	0.34	4.15	4.50	
Los Angeles	2,683,092	3,260,336	4,186,801	21.51	28.42	56.04	
Chicago	2,319,465	2,504,875	2,643,789	7.99	5.55	13.98	
San Francisco	1,079,722	1,308,154	1,701,576	21.16	30.07	57.59	
Philadelphia	1,407,890	1,407.439	1,505,265	-0.03	6.95	6.92	
Detroit	1,131,028	1,204,619	1,267,527	6.51	5.22	12.07	
Boston		894,291	985.130		10.16		
Washington, DC	477,932	592,848	704,521	24.04	18.84	47.41	
Dallas	597,281	818,727	1,113,964	37.08	36.06	86.51	
Houston	521,016	741,710	1,187,614	42.36	60.12	127.94	
Miami	415,469	610,392	921,094	46.92	50.90	121.70	
Atlanta	295,994	363,685	469,527	22.87	29.10	58.63	
Cleveland	885,769	915,279	930.835	3.33	1.70	5.09	
Seattle	482,789	592,281	787,762	22.68	33.00	63.17	
San Diego	387,480	501,392	744,771	29.40	48.54	92.21	
Minneapolis	486,303	564,490	690,844	16.08	22.38	42.06	
St. Louis	514,076	527,036	589.079	2.52	11.77	14.59	
Baltimore	461,916	471,870	500.289	2.15	6.02	8.31	
Pittsburgh	709,503	706,455	731,728	-0.43	3.58	3.13	
Phoenix	215,648	333,358	585,761	54.58	75.72	171.63	
Tampa	236,103	305,917	498,375	29.57	62.91	111.08	
Denver	239.665	292,762	416,035	22.15	42.11	73.59	
Cincinnati	401,016	425,386	471,083	6.08	10.74	17.47	
Milwaukee	473,186	497,016	538,955	5.04	8.44	13.90	
Kansas City	298,267	325,355	379,091	9.08	16.52	27.10	
Sacramento	205,727	240,530	340,573	16.92	41.59	65.55	
Portland	243.721	271,424	365,528	11.37	34.67	49.98	
Columbus	28 1,233	336,099	400,503	19.51	19.16	42.41	
San Antonio	243.044	300,279	392,051	23.55	30.56	61.31	
Indianapolis	341,642	381,439	423,754	11.65	11.09	24.03	
New Orleans	240,384	234,948	293,121	-2.26	24.76	21.94	
Buffalo	427,224	436,682	435,599	2.21	-0.25	1.96	
Providence		306,967	327,543		6.70		
Total	22,057,859	24,838,409	29,722,759	12.61	19.66	34.75	

'e

 Table 4-10. Workers Living & Working in the Same County, 1960-1980

	Workers	Percent	
	Working in	Same County	Change
Area	1980	1990	198030
New York City	3,800,709	4.624.268	21.67
Los Angeles	4,186,801	5,912,532	41.22
Chicago	2,658,007	3,021,022	13.66
San Francisco	1,759,569	2,359,914	34.12
Philadelphia	1,543,644	1,864,152	20.76
Detroit	1,293,803	1,452,994	12.30
Boston		1,361,952	
Washington, DC	745,561	1,114,010	49.42
Dallas	1,103,772	1,518,981	37.62
Houston	1,187,614	1,514,876	27.56
Miami	921,094	1,316,317	42.91
Atlanta	499,723	755,918	51.27
Cleveland	930,835	978,820	5.16
Seattle	787,762	1,096,398	39.18
San Diego	744,771	1,187,997	59.51
Minneapolis	696,043	845,743	21.51
St. Louis	592,911	697,777	17.69
Baltimore	504,758	655,513	29.87
Pittsburgh	762,680	785,817	3.03
Phoenix	585,761	977,648	66.90
Tampa	506,923	786,952	55.24
Denver	415,733	528,252	27.07
Cincinnati	404,519	546,922	35.20
Milwaukee	538,955	584,161	8.39
Kansas City	408,616	497,256	21.69
Sacramento	361,168	547,708	51.65
Portland	429,190	484,969	13.00
Norfolk	263,527	392,981	49.12
Columbus	443,300	566,769	27.85
San Antonio	392,051	531,319	35.52
Indianapolis	380,860	463,315	21.65
New Orleans	306,923	341,102	11.14
Buffalo	435,599	480,786	10.37
Charlotte	344,988	472,641	37.00
Providence		289,752	
Hartford		446,341	
Orlando	216,870	418,285	92.87
Salt Lake City	308,065	400,402	29.97
Rochester	357,071	411,106	15.13
Total	31.820.176	41.135.623	29.2s

 Table 4-10A
 Workers Living & Working in the Same County, 1980-1990

	Wor	Workers Living an king in Different C	nd ounties	Percent Change			
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960-70	1970-80	1960-80	
New York City	2,532,486	3,193,527	3,232,167	26.10	1.21	27.63	
Los Angeles	261,404	561,005	1,002,254	114.61	78.65	283.41	
Chicago	355,180	584,842	822,588	64.66	40.65	131.60	
San Francisco	317,793	516,310	781,389	62.47	51.34	145.88	
Philadelphia	473,463	771,080	821,792	62.86	6.58	73.57	
Detroit	293,558	494,027	568,983	68.29	15.17	93.82	
Boston		529,747	629,604		18.85		
Washington, DC	391,700	663,233	855,299	69.32	28.96	118.36	
Dallas	79,919	166,956	355,115	108.91	112.70	344.34	
Houston	49,546	113,717	320,597	129.52	181.93	547.07	
Miami	55,006	115,285	231,986	109.59	101.23	321.75	
Atlanta	147,772	296,328	480,503	100.53	62.15	225.17	
Cleveland	123,289	231,771	272,982	87.99	17.78	121.42	
Seattle	50,481	111,019	189,123	119.92	70.35	274.64	
San Diego	18,017	42,956	108,895	138.42	153.50	504.40	
Minneapolis	118,319	232,475	355,385	96.48	52.87	200.36	
St. Louis	267,746	372,562	415,425	39.15	11.50	55.16	
Baltimore	214,826	347,727	468,619	61.86	34.77	118.14	
Pittsburgh	104,394	146,696	181,152	40.52	23.49	73.53	
Phoenix	18,232	32,538	73,093	78.47	124.64	300.91	
Tampa	30,126	61,349	110,624	103.64	80.32	267.20	
Denver	117,698	204,295	391,984	73.58	91.87	233.04	
Cincinnati	121,740	170,297	221,341	39.89	29.97	81.81	
Milwaukee	69,034	130,215	181,353	88.62	39.27	162.70	
Kansas City	127,094	196,557	241,001	54.65	22.61	89.62	
Sacramento	25,198	52,650	94,516	108.95	79.52	275.09	
Portland	60,660	121,907	203,388	100.97	66.84	235.29	
Columbus	30,663	59,727	87,800	94.79	47.00	186.34	
San Antonio	16,741	28,924	57,039	72.77	97.20	240.71	
Indianapolis	69,774	108,186	154,005	55.05	42.35	120.72	
New Orleans	68,853	128,873	191,034	87.17	48.23	177.45	
Buffalo	39,760	58,459	64,243	47.03	9.89	61.58	
Providence		135,755	159,061		17.17		
Total	6,650,472	10,980,995	14,324,340	65.12	30.45	115.39	

# Table 4-11. Workers Living & Working in Different Counties, 1960-1980

	Workers I Working in Dif	Percent Change	
	1980	1990	1980-90
Area			
New York City	3,412,805	3,432,984	0.59
Los Angeles	1,002,254	896,511	-10.55
Chicago	836,960	820,315	-1.99
San Francisco	797,636	840,919	5.43
Philadelphia	827,759	930,765	12.44
Detroit	590,049	626,886	6.24
Boston		779,765	
Washington, DC	882,250	1,100,340	24.72
Dallas	348,755	457,625	31.22
Houston	320,597	244,920	-23.61
Miami	231,986	159,768	-31.13
Atlanta	492,467	725,863	47.39
Cleveland	282,982	263,279	-6.96
Seattle	189,123	211,940	12.06
San Diego	108,895	42,449	-61.02
Minneapolis	359,005	461,881	28.66
St. Louis	418,810	446,559	6.63
Baltimore	474,155	536,300	13.11
Pittsburgh	197,188	170,337	-13.62
Phoenix	73,093	18,847	-74.22
Tampa	113,551	127,759	12.51
Denver	391,283	436,660	11.60
Cincinnati	190,158	265,844	39.80
Milwaukee	181,353	188,591	3.99
Kansas City	252,298	274,053	8.62
Sacramento	106,702	138,237	29.55
Portland	232,967	239,563	2.83
Norfolk	216,348	306,018	41.45
Columbus	103,567	111,090	7.26
San Antonio	57,039	37,830	-33.68
Indianapolis	146,269	161,656	10.52
New Orleans	199,901	173,624	-13.15
Buffalo	64,243	50,336	-21.65
Charlotte	80,134	132,215	64.99
Providence		254,916	
Hartford		115,628	
Orlando	60,660	139,163	129.41
Salt Lake City	51,629	78,936	52.89
Rochester	46,185	70,361	52.35
Total	14,341,056	15,320,424	6.83

 Table 4-11A. Workers Living & Working in Different Counties, 1980-1990

	Flow from Place of Residence To Place of Work (as a % of all trips)									
	Centr	al - Central C	ounty	Centra	l - Suburban C	County				
Area	1980	1990	* Dif	1980	1990	* Dif				
New York City	8.52	8.06	-0.46	1.40	1.37	-0.03				
Los Angeles	64.10	57.54	-6.56	0.60	3.07	2.47				
Chicago	62.36	56.67	-5.68	3.37	5.39	2.02				
San Francisco	11.53	9.74	-1.80	1.85	2.27	0.42				
Philadelphia	23.02	19.27	-3.75	3.58	4.43	0.85				
Detroit	38.17	31.20	-6.96	7.22	8.97	1.75				
Washington, DC	15.04	12.41	-2.64	3.29	2.36	-0.93				
Dallas	51.87	44.11	-7.76	2.09	3.67	1.58				
Houston	78.06	74.86	-3.20	1.53	2.44	0.91				
Miami	61.97	59.27	-2.70	1.60	2.21	0.62				
Atlanta	20.67	15.32	-5.35	5.43	6.14	0.71				
Cleveland	51.27	47.47	-3.80	2.24	2.95	0.71				
Seattle	61.80	58.65	-3.15	2.56	3.34	0.78				
San Diego	100.00	100.00								
Minneapolis	41.43	37.24	-4.19	5.32	5.91	0.59				
St. Louis	12.52	9.28	-3.24	3.96	4.73	0.77				
Baltimore	24.57	19.15	-5.42	6.88	8.69	1.82				
Pittsburgh	64.47	60.83	-3.64	2.32	2.54	0.22				
Phoenix	100.00	100.00								
Tampa	44.06	42.22	-1.84	1.71	2.37	0.66				
Denver	22.69	16.57	-6.12	* 7.29	7.60	0.31				
Cincinnati	51.61	45.74	-5.87	2.90	4.53	1.63				
Milwaukee	56.79	50.50	-6.30	4.41	7.20	2.79				
Kansas City	39.87	32.17	-7.70	7.25	7.64	0.39				
Sacramento	75.05	64.23	-10.82	3.67	5.56	1.89				
Portland	40.98	32.88	-8.10	5.10	7.13	2.03				
Columbus	80.05	70.42	-9.63	1.31	2.22	0.90				
San Antonio	92.26	90.82	-1.44	0.40	0.54	0.14				
Indianapolis	58.81	60.08	1.28	2.32	4.11	1.80				
New Orleans	38.71	30.80	-7.91	6.52	6.20	-0.33				
Buffalo	79.02	79.04	0.02	2.54	2.50	-0.04				
Total	42.91	39.29	-3.62	2.76	3.66	0.90				

Table 4-12. Journey-to-Work Flows, Share of Commuters, 1980 and 1990

\*Dif - The difference is reported here rather than percentage change because the 1980 & 1990 data are based on different geographies, as detailed in Chapter 1.

	Flow from Place of Residence To Place of Work (as a % of all trips)											
	Suburb	an - Centra	l County	Suburl	Suburban - Same County			To Other Suburban County				
Area	1980	1990	*Dif	1980	1990	* Dif	1980	1990	*Dif			
New York City	20.10	17.31	-2.79	50.53	50.56	0.03	19.46	22.71	3.25			
Los Angeles	6.06	6.37	0.31	27.66	30.32	2.66	1.57	2.70	1.13			
Chicago	8.85	10.23	1.37	22.91	23.05	0.14	2.52	4.66	2.14			
San Francisco	9.09	7.87	-1.22	66.21	65.01	-1.20	11.32	15.11	3.80			
Philadelphia	10.49	8.79	-1.70	50.09	50.72	0.63	12.82	16.79	3.97			
Detroit	11.06	10.31	-0.75	37.29	40.38	3.08	6.25	9.14	2.89			
Washington, DC	25.80	23.40	-2.40	36.29	47.81	11.53	19.59	14.03	-5.56			
Dallas	11.00	14.40	3.39	32.79	34.25	1.46	2.25	3.57	1.33			
Houston	6.98	9.38	2.40	12.88	12.72	-0.16	0.55	0.60	0.05			
Miami	5.00	5.42	0.43	31.44	33.09	1.66						
Ațlanta	26.06	22.40	-3.66	34.38	37.01	2.63	13.47	19.13	5.67			
Cleveland	9.88	11.95	2.08	33.68	33.53	-0.16	2.93	4.10	1.17			
Seattle	8.43	10.81	2.38	27.14	26.98	-0.16	0.07	0.23	0.16			
San Diego												
Minneapolis	13.21	16.11	2.90	30.05	28.57	-1.48	10.00	12.17	2.17			
St. Louis	21.25	18.15	-3.10	52.51	52.88	0.38	9.77	14.96	5.19			
Baltimore	22.57	16.86	-5.71	37.83	42.58	4.74	8.15	12.71	4.57			
Pittsburgh	8.45	9.55	1.11	24.07	25.18	1.10	0.69	1.91	1.21			
Phoenix												
Tampa	3.66	5.64	1.98	49.32	46.68	-2.65	1.26	3.10	1.84			
Denver	25.86	22.18	-3.68	34.35	39.31	4.95	9.80	14.34	4.54			
Cincinnati	17.28	18.54	1.26	23.60	24.45	0.86	4.61	6.74	2.13			
Milwaukee	11.74	12.36	0.62	25.59	27.36	1.77	1.47	2.59	1.12			
Kansas City	15.89	15.46	-0.43	28.41	33.69	5.28	8.59	11.04	2.46			
Sacramento	5.85	8.81	2.95	15.24	18.59	3.35	0.19	2.81	2.62			
Portland	19.79	18.94	-0.85	31.62	35.92	4.30	2.51	5.13	2.62			
Columbus	6.34	10.86	4.52	11.96	15.58	3.62	0.34	0.93	0.59			
San Antonio	2.30	2.67	0.37	4.67	5.23	0.56	0.37	0.74	0.37			
Indianapolis	15.13	17.72	2.59	22.19	16.47	-5.72	1.56	1.62	0.05			
New Orleans	19.34	18.80	-0.55	33.92	38.44	4.51	1.51	5.77	4.27			
Buffalo	3.34	4.69	1.35	15.10	13.77	-1.33						
Total	12.43	11.98	-0.45	34.53	35.78	1.25	7.36	9.29	1.93			

Table 4-12. Journey-to-Work Flows, Share of Commuters, 1980 and 1990 (Cont.)

\* Dif - The difference is reported here rather than percent change because the 1980 & 1990 data are based on different geographies, as detailed in Chapter 1.

Generally speaking, the proportionate share of CC-SC commute flows increased between 1980 and 1990, but not by much. The areas with the largest increases were Milwaukee (2.79%) and Los Angeles (2.47%). Theses similarities belie large differences, particularly when examining these flows in conjunction with changes in total population. Milwaukee had only a 2.3% increase in population between 1980 and 1990, while Los Angeles had a 26% increase in population. Thus, the difference in the number of CC-SC commute flows in Milwaukee was 26,000, but in Los Angeles it was 179,000.

The proportionate share of Suburban County to Central County (SC-CC) commute flows varied widely between 1980 and 1990. In some areas, this type of commute flow declined by more than 3%, but in others the reverse was true. Areas where SC-CC commute flows declined as a share were Baltimore (-5.71%), Denver (-3.68%), Atlanta (-3.66%), St. Louis (-3.10%), and New York City (-2.79%). Areas where SC-CC commute flows increased as a share include Columbus (4.52%), Dallas (3.39%), Sacramento (2.95%), and Minneapolis (2.90%).

**Travel Time.** From 1980-1990, nationwide travel time to work increased by just 3.2%, increasing from 21.7 minutes to 22.4 minutes.<sup>3</sup> The modest increases from 1980 - 1990 may reflect more driving alone (a faster mode than most others) or dispersion of employment locations.

Table 4-13 highlights the mean travel times and percent changes, over the 1980-1990 period, for the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, for all modes and all workers (except work at home). These same data are shown graphically in Figure 4-10. The metropolitan areas showing the highest increases include San Diego, Orlando, Los Angeles, and Sacramento; all were over 10%. Decreases in mean travel time were registered in New York, Salt Lake City and Pittsburgh. In New York, average travel time went from 33.7 minutes in 1980 to 3 1.1 minutes in 1990, a drop of nearly 8%. This could signify several trends, such as job decentralization, the increases in privately owned vehicle travel (a faster mode), or localized factors such as the completion of major construction projects.

Table 4-14 examines various distributions of travel time intervals for the metropolitan areas. The most common trip time interval is between fifteen and twenty-nine minutes. This share ranges from a high of 45% of all workers in Salt Lake City to just under 30% in New York. The next most common interval is for work trips less than fifteen minutes. In Providence, over 35% of all workers had these comparatively quick commute times. The longest commute times, more than one hour, are most concentrated in New York, Washington, DC, and Chicago. Over 10% of the labor force in those areas experiences this lengthy commute time.

**Time Leaving Home to Go to Work.** These new data collected in the 1990 Census add more information on commuting characteristics in metropolitan areas. For both the U.S. as a whole and the thirtynine metropolitan areas, the highest percentages are in the 7:00 - 8:29 A.M. period. The national total has a much higher proportion who leave home between 5:00 - 6:59 A.M. The data show more regularity of departure times within the major metropolitan areas. Table 4-15 compares and summarizes this information for the U.S. and its large metropolitan areas. Table 4-16 lists percentages of time leaving home to go to work for each of the thirty-nine areas.

<sup>3</sup> Travel time was collected for the first time in the 1980 Census.



Figure 4-10. Mean Travel Time to Work, 1980 and 1990

		1980		1990			% Change
Area	Workers	Work at	Mean	Workers	Work at	Mean	<b>Travel Time</b>
	in Area	Home	Time	in Area	Home	Time	
New York City	7,248,643	102,084	33.1	8,057,252	186,512	31.1	-7.70
Los Angeles	5,189,055	78,972	23.6	6,809,043	186,102	26.4	11.87
Chicago	3,496,988	41,347	26.3	3,841,337	80,832	28.1	6.73
San Francisco	2,564,593	47,767	23.9	3,200,833	111,565	25.6	6.91
Philadelphia	2,378,301	36,551	24.0	2,794,917	63,090	24.1	0.47
Detroit	1,887,578	19,339	22.5	2,079,880	36,656	23.4	3.84
Boston			23.4	2,141,717	53,692	24.2	3.62
Washington, DC	1,646,632	26,268	27.2	2,214,350	62,878	29.5	8.53
Dallas	1,450,908	19,975	22.4	1,976,606	45,116	24.1	7.37
Houston	1,508,211	16,658	25.9	1,759,796	36,340	26.1	0.71
Miami	1,153,080	13,754	22.6	1,476,085	29,149	24.1	6.47
Atlanta	995,028	11,366	24.9	1,481,781	33,221	26.0	4.57
Cleveland	1,206,817	15,047	21.6	1,242,099	24,401	22.0	1.67
Seattle	976,885	20,241	22.8	1,308,338	43,979	24.3	6.73
San Diego	853,666	17,397	19.5	1,230,446	61,285	22.2	13.69
Minneapolis	1,055,726	24,427	20.1	1,307,624	44,425	21.1	4.93
St. Louis	1,012,460	16,346	22.6	1,144,336	27,152	23.1	2.25
Baltimore	979,973	13,571	25.3	1,191,813	27,216	26.0	2.65
Pittsburgh	963,336	11,201	22.8	956,154	19,808	22.6	-1.05
Phoenix	658,854	10,545	21.6	996,495	29,309	23.0	6.49
Tampa	622,490	9.473	20.2	914.711	20,769	21.8	7.84
Denver	806.904	16.640	22.0	964.912	34,767	22.4	1.93
Cincinnati	587,898	9.362	21.8	812.766	17.042	22.1	1.43
Milwaukee	720.308	11,409	18.8	112.752	17.331	20.0	0.15
Kansas City	963 211	10 362	20.7	771 309	21 337	21.4	3.56
Sacramento	471 851	8 732	19.5	685 945	21,337	21.1	11.80
Portland	670.458	12 498	21.4	124 532	27,306	21.0	1 50
Norfolk	531 647	12,490	21.4	698 999	37 301	21.7	2.98
Columbus	550.284	7 518	21.0	677 850	15 620	21.0	5.67
San Antonio	449,090	6 386	20.1	560 140	13,029	21.2	9.34
Indiananalia	522 540	0,380	20.2	624 071	14 080	21.9	5.40
New Orleans	510 747	5,107	20.8	514 726	0 077	21.9	0.57
	510,747	5,107	24.3	521,122	0,077	24.4	-0.37
Buffalo	499,842	7,480	19.3	531,122	9,808	19.4	0.67
Charlotte	472,188		19.9	604,856	11,390	21.6	8.60
Providence	486,604		18.3	544,668	7,352	19.6	6.95
Hartford			20.1	561,969	10,967	20.6	2.51
Orlando	324,943		20.3	557,448	10,883	22.9	12.72
Salt Lake City	384,078		20.2	479,338	14,846	19.8	-1.92
Rochester	421,779		19.3	481,467	11,709	19.7	2.21
Total	44,303,366	657,203		53,633,939	1,371,404	25.2	

# Table 4-13. Journey-to-Work Flows, Mean Travel Times and Percent Changes, 1980 and 1990

	15 Minutes	15 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 59	60 Minutes	Work at
Area	or Less	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	or More	Home
New York City	21.23	28.15	16.66	15.13	16.51	2.31
Los Angeles	23.81	34.36	17.86	12.01	9.22	2.73
Chicago	22.73	30.94	18.22	15.33	10.67	2.10
San Francisco	24.56	34.83	16.82	12.39	7.91	3.49
Philadelphia	27.20	35.38	16.62	12.21	6.33	2.26
Detroit	25.74	39.48	17.85	10.73	4.42	1.76
Boston	27.70	33.40	17.38	12.62	6.40	2.51
Washington, DC	17.45	30.93	20.08	18.06	10.65	2.84
Dallas	23.71	38.43	19.39	11.31	4.88	2.28
Houston	22.14	34.96	20.18	13.44	7.21	2.07
Miami	22.13	38.49	21.61	11.16	4.63	1.97
Atlanta	20.40	35.49	20.81	14.97	6.10	2.24
Cleveland	27.75	41.00	16.90	9.02	3.36	1.96
Seattle	23.95	37.81	17.58	11.86	5.45	3.36
San Diego	26.43	40.08	16.65	7.91	3.95	4.98
Minneapolis	28.21	42.63	15.33	7.76	2.68	3.40
St. Louis	25.37	39.06	18.64	10.63	3.93	2.37
Baltimore	21.36	36.87	18.89	13.43	7.17	2.29
Pittsburgh	29.24	37.29	15.76	10.91	4.74	2.07
Phoenix	26.09	38.65	18.14	10.09	4.08	2.94
Tampa	29.03	39.16	16.61	8.94	3.99	2.27
Denver	25.83	40.83	17.32	8.95	3.47	3.60
Cincinnati	26.49	42.19	17.28	8.71	3.24	2.10
Milwaukee	32.27	43.14	13.61	6.00	274	2.24
Kansas City	27.87	41.63	17.04	7.70	3.00	2.77
Sacramento	29.05	40.47	15.40	7.79	4.19	3.11
Portland	28.27	40.91	15.37	7.98	3.70	3.77
Norfolk	26.03	40.92	16.39	8.07	3.25	5.34
Columbus	27.91	43.90	15.60	7.09	3.19	2.31
San Antonio	25.43	44.29	17.82	6.49	3.67	2.30
Indianapolis	26.80	42.79	17.11	7.44	3.46	2.40
New Orleans	24.05	39.15	18.73	9.80	6.54	1.72
Buffalo	33.47	42.57	14.28	5.51	2.33	1.85
Charlotte	27.90	40.96	17.21	8.80	3.25	1.88
Providence	36.24	39.87	11.90	6.42	3.82	1.75
Hartford	30.55	40.87	15.86	8.26	2.51	1.95
Orlando	24.41	39.84	19.96	10.36	3.48	1.95
Salt Lake City	31.27	44.91	12.75	4.94	3.03	3.10
Rochester	32.14	42.74	12.94	6.44	2.70	2.43

 Table 4-14. Travel Time Intervals to Work, Percent Distribution (in minutes), 1990

Time Interval	U.S. Totals	Thirty-nine Metropolitan Areas
5:00 A.M 6:59 A.M.	26.0%	25.5%
7:00 A.M 8:29 A.M.	41.9%	42.4%
8:30 A.M 9:59 A.M.	10.3%	11.3%
All Other Departures	18.9%	17.9%
Worked at Home	3.0%	2.6%

 Table 4-15. Departure Time Intervals for Work Trips, U.S. and Large Metropolitan Areas, Percentage Distributions, 1990



i s i

. 4. 7

	5:00 AM -	6:59 AM	7:00 AM -	8:29 AM	8:30 AM - 9:59 AM All Other Departures		epartures	Work At Home		
Area	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New York City	1,570,501	19.49	3,737,872	46.39	1,274,483	15.82	1,287,884	15.98	186,512	2.31
Los Angeles	1,988,648	29.21	2,617,755	38.45	760,033	11.16	1,256,505	18.45	186,102	2.73
Chicago	1,103,783	28.73	1,530,200	39.84	382,474	9.96	744,048	19.37	80,832	2.10
San Francisco	768,998	24.02	1,355,709	42.35	405,089	12.66	559,472	17.48	111,565	3.49
Philadelphia	627,737	22.46	1,276,894	45.69	346,080	12.38	481,116	17.21	63,090	2.26
Detroit	520,191	25.01	820,637	39.46	241,185	11.60	461,211	22.17	36,656	1.76
Boston	471,202	22.00	975,233	45.54	280,935	13.12	360,655	16.84	53,692	2.51
Washington, DC	600,459	27.12	955,168	43.14	294,843	13.32	301,002	13.59	62,878	2.84
Dallas	487,123	24.64	916,220	46.35	192,731	9.75	335,416	16.97	45,116	2.28
Houston	530,435	30.14	749,876	42.61	159,121	9.04	284,024	16.14	36,340	2.07
Miami	318,027	21.55	669,317	45.34	211,396	14.32	248,196	16.81	29,149	1.97
Atlanta	356,320	24.05	681,426	45.99	170,578	11.51	240,236	16.21	33,221	2.24
Cleveland	294,832	23.74	524,429	42.22	141,275	11.37	257,162	20.70	24,401	1.96
Seattle	400,819	30.64	479,388	36.64	132,567	10.13	251,585	19.23	43,979	3.36
San Diego	385,153	31.30	452,757	36.80	123,089	10.00	208,162	16.92	61,285	4.98
Minneapolis	336,796	25.76	553,706	42.34	121,642	9.30	251,055	19.20	44,425	3.40
St. Louis	323,881	28.30	467,488	40.85	104,661	9.15	221,154	19.33	27,152	2.37
Baltimore	327,625	27.49	510,023	42.79	127,465	10.70	199,424	16.73	27,276	2.29
Pittsburgh	234,780	24.55	394,827	41.29	111,819	11.69	194,920	20.39	19,808	2.07
Phoenix	304,458	30.55	371,992	37.33	84,506	8.48	206,230	20.70	29,309	2.94
Tampa	219,476	23.99	406,547	44.45	103,593	11.33	164,326	17.96	20,769	2.27
Denver	267,898	27.76	405,822	42.06	90,147	9.34	166,278	17.23	34,767	3.60
Cincinnati	199,692	24.57	343,486	42.26	84,981	10.46	167,565	20.62	17.042	2.10
Milwaukee	222,872	28.84	298,959	38.69	63,952	8.28	169,638	21.95	17,331	2.24
Kansas City	196,467	25. 41	348, 983	45. 25	66, 594	8.63	137, 928	17.88	21, 337	2.77
Sacramento	185,147	26. 99	285, 503	41.62	68, 697	10.01	125,260	18.26	21,338	3.11
Portland	186,937	25. 80	303, 093	41.83	<b>68</b> , 7 <b>4</b> 9	9. 49	138, 447	19.11	27, 306	3. 77
Norfolk	223, 416	31.96	249, 685	35. 72	68, 011	9. 73	120, 586	17.25	37, 301	5. 34
Columbus	165,390	24.40	292, 139	43. 10	<b>67, 85</b> 7	10.01	136, 844	20. 19	15, 629	<b>2.3</b> 1
San Antonio	150, 467	26.44	248, 679	43. 69	<b>51, 785</b>	9.10	105, 103	18.47	13,115	2. 30
Indianapolis	165,657	26.51	274, 029	43. 85	53, 295	8. 53	117,001	18.72	14,989	2.40
New Orleans	143, 400	27.86	214, 906	41. 75	56, 443	10.97	91, 100	17.70	8, 877	1. 72
Buffalo	110,965	20. 89	224, 608	42.29	68, 428	12.88	117,313	22.09	9, 808	1.85
Charlotte	162,308	26. 83	265, 673	43. 92	52, 810	8.73	112,675	18.63	11,390	1.88
Providence	136,524	25.07	237, 001	43. 51	59, 607	10.94	101, 999	18.73	9, 537	1.75
Hartford	147,381	26. 23	254, 009	45. 20	58, 474	10. 41	91, 138	16. 22	10, 967	1.95
Orlando	143,497	25. 74	242, 671	43. 53	57, 126	10. 25	103, 271	18.53	10, 883	1.95
Salt Lake City	119,112	24.85	197, 340	41.17	49, 296	10.28	<b>98</b> , 744	20.60	14, 846	3. 10
Rochester	122,416	25.43	203,430	42.25	52,856	10.98	91,056	18.91	11,709	2.43
Total	15,220,790	25.49	25,337,480	42.44	6,908,673	11.57	10,705,729	17.93	1,531,729	2.57

 Table 4-16. Time Leaving Home to Go to Work, 1990

# **Chapter 5**

# **MEANS OF JOURNEY TO WORK**

This chapter reviews mode choice for the commute trip over the thirty year period from 1960 to 1990. During this time, the interstate highway system was virtually completed, maximum speed limits for motor vehicles were lowered and then later raised on many highways, automobiles became smaller and more fuel efficient, and several new subway systems were built. Drive alone trips continued to be the number one form of commuting. Losses in market share took place in public transit, carpooling and even walking, although there was some growth in the number of people who work at home.

During the 1980's, mode choice continued to shift. The most striking changes were the increases in driving alone and decreases in carpooling. Factors influencing these statistics were increasing employment opportunities in the suburbs, and increases in multiple worker households, including women with young children.

## The Use of Privately Owned Vehicles for Commuting'

The privately owned vehicle in general, and driving alone in specific, is unquestionably the mode of choice for most American workers. In 1960, about 43 million workers commuted by private vehicle. By 1990 this figure had risen to over 101 million; a gain of over 135% during the thirty year period.

Private automobile travel continued to increase in the 1980's; a decade which saw falling gasoline prices in real terms, and greater consumer certainty about gasoline supplies. These factors coupled with increasingly more fuel efficient cars, continued decentralization of jobs and residences, and alterations in traditional work schedules all contributed to the relative attractiveness of driving alone.

**Commuting Shares Accounted for by Private/y Owned Vehicles.** In almost every instance in the thirty years from 1960-1990, private vehicles acquired increasingly higher shares of all metropolitan area work trips (Tables 5-1 and 5-1A). As a share of all commuting trips, private vehicles increased nationally from 69.5% in 1960 to 88% in 1990. Within large metropolitan areas, private vehicle commutes accounted for 61% of all trips in 1960 and 83.4% in 1990.

In fourteen of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, over 90% of workers used a private vehicle for commuting in 1990. The leaders included Charlotte, Detroit, Dallas, Kansas City and Indianapolis. New York City had the lowest share (62.5%), but even this was slightly higher than the comparable figure for 1980.

Privately owned vehicle trips include driving alone and vehicle pools in automobiles, vans, light trucks, and motorcycles.

	V	Vorkers in Are	a	Workers Travel by POV			Percent Travel by POV		
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960	1970	1980	1960	1970	1980
New York City	5,886,760	6,559,153	6,737,5 11	2,192,250	3,314,378	3,977,392	37.24	50.53	59.03
Los Angeles	2,944,496	3,821,341	5,189,055	2,274,396	3,330,757	4,524,246	77.24	87.16	87.19
Chicago	2,674,645	3,089,717	3,466,377	1,414,679	2,095,454	2,630,165	52.89	67.82	75.88
San Francisco	1,397,515	1,824,464	2,482,965	927.927	1,420,706	1,963,376	66.40	77.87	79.07
Philadelphia	1,881,353	2,178,519	2,327,057	1,073,301	1,515,289	1,816,549	57.05	69.56	78.06
Detroit	1,424,586	1,698,646	1,836.510	1,055,911	1,438,246	1,673,686	74.12	84.67	91.13
Boston		1,424,038	1,614,734		1,010,172	1,232,447		70.94	76.33
Washington, DC	869,632	1,256,081	1,559,820	521,720	926,921	1,189,284	59.99	73.79	76.24
Dallas	677,200	985,683	1,469,079	516,746	866,241	1,345,065	76.31	87.88	91.56
Houston	570,562	855,427	1,508,211	424,975	741,565	1,381,989	74.48	86.69	91.63
Miami	470,475	725,677	1,153,080	336,441	612,610	1,021,006	71.51	84.42	88.55
Atlanta	443,766	660,013	950,030	308,584	562,253	836,837	69.54	85.19	88.09
Cleveland	1,009,058	1,147,050	1,203,817	699,909	933,960	1,040,813	69.36	81.42	86.46
Seattle	533,270	703,300	976,885	384,824	580,193	813,178	72.16	82.50	83.24
Sau Diego	405,497	544,348	853,666	265,008	412,447	693,573	65.35	75.77	81.25
Minneapolis	604,622	796,965	1,046,229	413,032	637,985	868,533	68.31	80.05	83.02
St. Louis	781,822	899,598	1,004,504	527,382	749,506	890,557	67.46	83.32	88.66
Baltimore	676,742	819,597	968,908	424,792	623,557	793,773	62.77	76.08	81.92
Pittsburgh	813,897	853,151	912,880	496,000	624,872	730.610	60.94	73.24	80.03
Phoenix	233,880	365,896	658,854	179,000	325,190	587,125	76.53	88.87	89.11
Tampa	266,229	367,266	608,999	194,049	321,670	547,706	72.89	87.59	89.94
Denver	357,363	497,057	808,019	262,803	423,329	691,568	73.54	85.17	85.59
Cincinnati	522,756	595,683	692,424	359,103	496,615	610,795	68.69	83.37	88.21
Milwaukee	542,220	627,23 1	720,308	341,371	487,148	608,846	62.96	77.67	84.53
Kansas City	425,361	521,912	620,092	309,344	453,477	560,769	72.73	86.89	90.43
Sacramento	230,925	293,180	435,089	183,479	255,919	377,025	79.45	87.29	86.65
Portland	304,381	393,331	568,916	221,830	327,975	473,797	72.88	83.38	83.28
Columbus	311,896	395,826	488,303	219,780	325,435	432.116	70.47	82.22	88.49
San Antonio	259,785	329,203	449,090	172,588	263,792	390,810	66.43	80.13	87.02
Indianapolis	411,416	489,625	577,759	299.915	417,315	526,632	72.90	85.23	91.15
New Orleans	309,237	363,821	484,155	163,116	253,788	398,903	52.75	69.76	82.39
Buffalo	466,984	495,141	499,842	313,001	392,070	426,487	67.03	79.18	85.32
Providence		442,722	486,604		367,950	424,286		83.11	87.19
Total	28,708,331	35,153,902	43,258,434	17,477,256	26,130,663	34,823,211	60.88	74.33	80.50

 Table 5-1. Workers Use of Privately Owned Vehicles, 1960-1980

	Workers i	in Areas	Workers Travel by POV		Percent Trav	el by POV
Area	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
New York City	7248,643	8,057,252	4,434,163	5,038,702	61.17	62.54
Los Angeles	5,189,055	6,809,043	4,524,246	5,978,283	87.19	87.80
Chicago	3,496,988	3,841,337	2,657,720	3,049,431	76.00	79.38
San Francisco	2,564,593	3,200,833	2,031,909	2,602,203	79.23	81.30
Philadelphia	2,378,301	2,794,917	1,863,340	2,271,550	78.35	81.27
Detroit	1,887,578	2,079,880	1,721,228	1,928,862	91.19	92.74
Boston		2,141,717		1,721,420		80.38
Washington, DC	1,,646,632	2,214,350	1,265,348	1,743,115	76.84	78.72
Dallas	1,450,908	1,976,606	1,328,510	1,828,641	91.56	92.51
Houston	1,508,211	1,759,796	1,381,989	1,594,796	91.63	90.62
Miami	1,153,080	1,476,085	1,021,006	1,325,040	88.55	89.77
Atlanta	995,028	1,481,781	879,049	1,344,050	88.34	90.71
Cleveland	1,206,817	1,242,099	1,040,813	1,115,769	86.24	89.83
Seattle	976,885	1,308,338	813,178	1,116,958	83.24	85.37
San Diego	853,666	1,230,446	693,573	1,041,651	81.25	84.66
Minneapolis	1,055,726	1,307,624	876,693	1,140,292	83.04	87.20
St. Louis	1,012,460	1,144,336	897,318	1,050,392	88.63	91.79
Baltimore	979,973	1,191,813	803,635	1,014,461	82.01	85.12
Pittsburgh	963,336	956,154	776,189	805,276	80.57	84.22
Phoenix	658,854	996,495	587,125	890,988	89.11	89.41
Tampa	622,490	914,711	559,912	842,308	89.95	92.08
Denver	806,904	964,912	690.575	843,448	85.58	87.41
Cincimrati	587,898	812,766	515,154	736,585	87.63	90.63
Milwaukee	720,308	772,752	608,846	680,827	84.53	88.10
Kansas City	663,211	771,309	598,266	712,685	90.21	92.40
Sacramento	471,851	685,945	409,807	609,800	86.85	88.90
Portland	670,458	724,532	564,505	623,518	84.20	86.06
Norfolk	531,647	698,999	442,983	607,168	83.32	86.86
Columbus	550,284	677,859	488,823	616,342	88.83	90.92
San Antonio	449,090	569,149	390,810	508,377	87.02	89.32
Indianapolis	523,549	624,971	477,837	578,705	91.27	92.60
New Orleans	510,747	514,726	423,644	443,696	82.95	86.20
Buffalo	499,842	531,122	426,487	468,941	85.32	88.29
Charlotte	472,188	604,856	434,162	564,043	91.95	93.25
providence		544,668		495,377		90.95
Hartford		561,969		509,307		90.63
Orlando	324,943	557,448	289,397	509,215	89.06	91.35
Salt Lake City	384,078	479,338	338,732	432,770	88.19	90.28
Rochester	427,779	481,467	367,538	430,132	85.92	89.34
Total	46,444,001	56,456,047	37,624,510	47,089,020	81.01	83.41

 Table 5-1A. Workers Use of Privately Owned Vehicles, 1980-1990

Tables 5-2 and 5-2A illustrate changes by central county and suburban county. Viewing the 1960-1990 period as a whole, it is apparent that suburban county growth of private vehicle travel far exceeded that in the central county and mirrors the growth in residential population in the suburban counties. Moreover, alternatives to driving a private vehicle, such as walking or taking transit, are generally less available.

**Privately Owned Vehicles – Drivers, Passengers and Occupancy Rates.** The declines in private vehicle occupancy experienced during the 1970's continued unabated in the 1980's (Tables 5-3 and 5-3A). In 1970, occupancy rates ranged from 1.11 in Los Angeles to 1.24 in Baltimore. Most of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas consistently exhibited occupancy levels of less than 1.1 in 1990. The range in 1990 varied from 1.06 in Detroit and Cleveland to 1.13 in Washington, D.C. compared to ranges of 1.07 (Salt Lake City) to 1.38 (Norfolk) in 1980.

Vehicle occupancy rates tended to be higher in central counties and lower in suburban counties (Table 5-4). There were many opportunities in central counties to take advantage of work location densities through the use of vehicle pools or other shared arrangements. In 1990, New York had a central county occupancy rate of 1.25 compared to 1.10 in its suburban counties, but typically the central/suburban spread was much less. In a few cases, suburban county occupancy rates were actually higher than their central county counterparts (Charlotte, Rochester, Seattle, Minneapolis, Salt Lake City). This may be suggestive of a decentralized, but still concentrated, network of employment locations; i.e., large corporate headquarters or manufacturing plants situated in the suburban and exurban rings of metropolitan areas.

Similarly, Privately Owned Vehicle (POV) use is increasing in both central and suburban counties, but is increasing more substantially in suburban counties. Table 5-5 shows that in general POV drivers in suburban counties are increasing more quickly than POV passengers. Consequently POV occupancy is declining.

### Individual Modal Trends

Tables 5-6, 5-6A and 5-7 present various counts of journey to work by mode in the 1980 and 1990 periods. The Census questionnaire asks each worker for one method of transportation used to make the journey to work. If an individual uses more than one method, he or she is asked to answer with the method used for the longest distance. For example, a person who drives alone for two miles to a park and ride lot and then takes a bus for 8 miles would answer "bus". These data will be discussed below:

**Driving Alone.** A major result of the 1990 journey-to-work data, compared to 1980, was the increase in commuters who drive alone. In 1980, 64.4% of all commuters, 62.2 million, drove to work alone. By 1990, that figure increased to 73.2% or 84.2 million workers. Much of the gain in numbers of people driving alone from 1980 to 1990 came at the expense of cat-pooling, and to a lesser degree from transit. Of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, in both 1980 and 1990, Detroit had the highest proportion of workers driving alone to work.
	Central	County	Suburban	County
Area	1960-70	1970-80	1960-70	1970-80
New York City	34.29	4.71	51.60	20.33
Los Angeles	31.92	21.77	100.89	70.44
Chicago	38.35	14.85	71.85	46.39
San Francisco	18.06	-0.24	58.93	42.94
Philadelphia	22.95	-7.09	48.39	28.72
Detroit	19.35	-3.72	63.56	40.15
Boston		4.69		24.20
Washington, DC	21.54	-14.87	97.35	37.63
Dallas	67.75	45.50	67.48	68.02
Houston	76.26	79.31	66.77	119.04
Miami	70.14	52.05	113.67	97.43
Atlanta	48.62	1.77	106.15	73.03
Cleveland	28.90	0.67	39.50	24.73
Seattle	44.21	35.19	64.04	48.98
San Diego	55.64	68.16		
Minneapolis	40.30	21.71	71.91	50.65
St. Louis	3.79	-19.37	57.71	28.72
Baltimore	15.57	-10.44	70.82	46.95
Pittsburgh	24.29	12.19	29.15	25.46
Phoenix	81.67	80.55		
Tampa	54.24	54.94	79.80	86.28
Denver	28.18	13.57	94.37	96.58
Cincinnati	35.75	11.76	41.86	38.06
Milwaukee	31.81	11.17	68.87	50.88
Kansas City	37.19	9.48	57.83	38.39
Sacramento	38.63	43.58	43.31	63.68
Portland	26.41	14.41	84.22	79.45
Columbus	48.28	29.29	47.10	49.48
San Antonio	53.23	45.76	47.75	80.87
Indianapolis	34.62	17.5 1	47.95	41.59
New Orleans	24.88	23.87	100.33	87.44
Buffalo	27.30	1.94	16.99	12.47
Providence		-13.24		20.00

 Table 5-2. Workers Travel by Privately Owned Vehicles, Percent Change Between 1960-1980

Area	Central County	Suburban County
New York City	19.34	13.54
Los Angeles	21.94	50.19
Chicago	9.03	23.24
San Francisco	23.14	28.47
Philadelphia	6.57	25.42
Detroit	-0.54	21.81
Boston	20.88	
Washington, DC	2.85	42.08
Dallas	19.40	58.95
Houston	11.10	31.90
Miami	23.20	40.55
Atlanta	30.79	59.24
Cleveland	2.55	11.83
Seattle	33.24	43.93
San Diego	50.48	
Minneapolis	21.04	37.28
St. Louis	1.43	19.61
Baltimore	9.51	31.42
Pittsburgh	5.38	1.49
Phoenix	51.76	
Tampa	47.90	52.57
Denver	-1.83	31.40
Cincinnati	10.42	95.71
Milwaukee	5.56	20.41
Kansas City	8.12	27.28
Sacramento	44.30	61.10
Portland	-8.37	25.61
Norfolk	4.63	45.01
Columbus	26.03	26.23
San Antonio	28.48	47.56
Indianapolis	15.97	30.92
New Orleans	-7.80	11.60
Buffalo	10.04	9.60
Charlotte	38.01	24.01
Providence	14.19	
Hartford	6.79	
Orlando	62.54	104.49
Salt Lake City	26.10	31.45
Rochester	14.10	25.11

 Table 52A. Workers Travel by Privately Owned Vehicles, Percent Change Between 1980-1990

	POV E	Drivers	POV Pas	ssengers	POV Occ	cupancy
Area	1970	1980	1970	1980	1970	1980
New York City	2,833,579	3,425,970	480,799	551,422	1.17	1.16
Los Angeles	2,996,353	4,032,576	334,404	491,670	1.11	1.12
Chicago	1,752,845	2,303,899	342,609	326,266	1.20	1.14
San Francisco	1,261,920	1,736,046	158,786	227,330	1.13	1.13
Philadelphia	1,283,728	1,579,944	231,561	236,605	1.18	1.15
Detroit	1,255,511	1,503,632	182,735	170,054	1.15	1.11
Boston	840,109	1,067,602	170,063	164,845	1.20	1.15
Washington, DC	760,403	980,109	166,518	209,175	1.22	1.21
Dallas	741,906	1,175,438	124,335	169,627	1.17	1.14
Houston	633,824	1,188,768	107,741	193,221	1.17	1.16
Miami	524,684	899,771	87,926	121,235	1.17	1.13
Atlanta	475,377	732,353	86,876	104,484	1.18	1.14
Cleveland	808,385	935,708	125,575	105,105	1.16	1.11
Seattle	507,705	713,052	72,488	100,126	1.14	1.14
San Diego	365,288	611,093	47,159	82,480	1.13	1.13
Minneapolis	534,457	751,920	103,528	116,613	1.19	1.16
St. Louis	624,806	768,506	124,700	122,051	1.20	1.16
Baltimore	502,397	669,916	121,160	123,857	1.24	1.18
Pittsburgh	531,187	63 1,482	93,685	99,128	1.18	1.16
Phoenix	287,568	517,967	37,622	69,158	1.13	1.13
Tampa	280,106	486,426	41,564	61,280	1.15	1.13
Denver	371,670	601,512	51,689	90,056	1.14	1.15
Cincinnati	418,731	540,265	77,884	70,530	1.19	1.13
Milwaukee	414,790	533,929	72,358	74,917	1.17	1.14
Kansas City	379,391	486,574	74,086	74,195	1.20	1.15
Sacramento	226,896	334,772	29,023	42,253	1.13	1.13
Portland	287,478	418,396	40,497	55,401	1.14	1.13
Columbus	278,321	383,806	47,114	48,310	1.17	1.13
San Antonio	222,246	340,517	41,546	50,293	1.19	1.15
Indianapolis	345,944	459,864	71,371	66,768	1.21	1.15
New Orleans	211,949	342,486	41,839	56,417	1.20	1.16
Buffalo	331,873	375,346	60,197	51,141	1.18	1.14
Providence	301,362	364,822	66,588	59,464	1.22	1.16
Total	23,592,789	31,894,467	3,916,026	4,585,477	1.17	1.14

 Table 5-3. Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, 1970-1980

	POV I	Drivers	ivers POV Passengers		POV Oc	cupancy
Area	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
New York City	3,777,200	4,577,141	656,983	461,561	1.17	1.10
Los Angeles	4,032,576	5,396,643	491,670	581,640	1.12	1.11
Chicago	2,324,561	2,798,921	333,159	250,510	1.14	1.09
San Francisco	1,789,602	2,372,801	242,307	229,402	1.14	1.10
Philadelphia	1,616,637	2,087,549	246.703	184,001	1.15	1.09
Detroit	1,542,361	1,817,245	178,867	111,617	1.12	1.06
Boston		1,602,738		118,682		1.07
Washington, DC	1,030,479	1,543,801	234,869	199,314	1.23	1.13
Dallas	1,163,718	1,680,335	164,792	148,306	1.14	1.09
Houston	1,188,768	1,453,911	193,221	140,885	1.16	1.10
Miami	899,771	1,209,623	121,235	115,417	1.13	1.10
Atlanta	762,241	1,242,028	116,808	102,022	1.15	1.08
Cleveland	935,708	1,048,353	105,105	67,416	1.11	1.06
Seattle	713,052	1,032,699	100,126	84,259	1.14	1.08
San Diego	611,093	950,262	82,480	91,389	1.13	1.10
Minneapolis	757,602	1,061,730	119,091	78,562	1.16	1.07
St. Louis	773,540	975,258	123,778	75,134	1.16	1.08
Baltimore	676,843	921,156	126,792	93,305	1.19	1.10
Pittsburgh	664,770	739,649	111,419	65,627	1.17	1.09
Phoenix	517,967	8 14,074	69,158	76,914	1.13	1.09
Tampa	495,836	777,386	64,076	64,922	1.13	1.08
Denver	600,897	779,545	89.678	63,903	1.15	1.08
Cincinnati	461,487	687,070	53,666	49,515	1.12	1.07
Milwaukee	533,929	636,119	74,917	44,708	1.14	1.07
Kansas City	508,130	660,713	84,487	51,972	1.17	1.08
Sacramento	360,205	559,3 10	49,602	50,490	1.14	1.09
Portland	489.593	575,942	74,912	47,576	1.15	1.08
Norfolk	320,494	553,267	122,489	53,901	1.38	1.10
Columbus	429.371	575.641	59,452	40,701	1.14	1.07
San Antonio	340,517	462,800	50,293	45,577	1.15	1.10
Indianapolis	431,367	535,929	56,470	42,776	1.13	1.08
New Orleans	360,352	400,395	63,292	43,301	1.18	1.11
Buffalo	375,346	437,442	51,141	31,499	1.14	1.07
Charlotte	324,304	516,599	109,858	47,444	1.34	1.09
Providence		458,997		36,380		1.08
Hartford		474,640		34,667		1.07
Orlando	225,316	469,609	64.08 1	39.606	1.28	1.08
Salt Lake City	253,608	396,396	18,578	36,374	1.07	1.09
Rochester	277,432	400,707	90,106	29,425	1.32	1.07
Total	32,566,673	43,148,049	4,995,661	3.940.971	1.15	1.09

 Table 5-3A. Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, 1980-1990

		Central County		Suburban County			
Area	POV Drivers	POV Passengers	Occupancy	POV Drivers	POV Passengers	Occupancy	
New York City	70,039	17,473	1.25	4,507,102	444,088	1.10	
Los Angeles	3,171,178	353,007	1.11	2,225,465	228,633	1.10	
Chicago	1,567,967	166,018	1.11	1,230,954	84,492	1.07	
San Francisco	166,740	24,372	1.15	2,206,060	205.03 1	1.09	
Philadelphia	324,107	46,383	1.14	1,763,441	137,619	1.08	
Detroit	694,714	51,683	1.07	1,122,531	59,934	1.05	
Boston	126,486	16,560	1.13	1,476,251	102,123	1.07	
Washington, DC	123,023	20,292	1.16	1,420,778	179,022	1.13	
Dallas	780,649	73,836	1.09	899,686	74,470	1.08	
Houston	1,110,101	107,674	1.10	343,809	33,212	1.10	
Miami	705,705	75,292	1.11	503,917	40,126	1.08	
Atlanta	237,021	19,072	1.08	1,005,007	82,950	1.08	
Cleveland	497,810	34,825	1.07	550,543	32,59 1	1.06	
Seattle	617,353	48,943	1.08	415,347	35,315	1.09	
San Diego	950,262	91,389	1.10				
Minneapolis	442,434	28,968	1.07	619,297	49,593	1.08	
St. Louis	115,691	12,040	1.10	859,568	63,093	1.07	
Baltimore	179,256	28,963	1.16	741,900	64,342	1.09	
Pittsburgh	433,441	41,370	1.10	306,208	24,257	1.08	
Phoenix	8 14,074	76,914	1.09				
Tampa	348,344	30,004	1.09	429,042	34,918	1.08	
Denver	172,802	16,222	1.09	606,743	47,681	1.08	
Cincinnati	328,256	23,386	1.07	358,814	26,129	1.07	
Milwaukee	343,790	27,807	1.08	292,328	16,902	1.06	
Kansas City	253,100	22,273	1.09	407,613	29,699	1.07	
Sacramento	396,782	36,108	1.09	162,528	14,382	1.09	
Portland	210,981	19,714	1.09	364,961	27,862	1.08	
Norfolk	81,399	9,821	1.12	471,868	44,080	1.09	
Columbus	410,239	28,59 1	1.07	165,401	12,111	1.07	
San Antonio	418,586	41,270	1.10	44,214	4,307	1.10	
Indianapolis	335,556	28,093	1.08	200,373	14,683	1.07	
New Orleans	122,444	15,836	1.13	277,95 1	27,465	1.10	
Buffalo	353,229	26,058	1.07	84,213	5,441	1.06	
Charlotte	234,129	18,616	1.08	282,470	28,828	1.10	
Providence	46,398	5,818	1.13	405,668	22,212	1.05	
Hartford	34,060	4,822	1.14	440,579	29,846	1.07	
Orlando	294,279	25,682	1.09	175,330	13,924	1.08	
Salt Lake City	270,692	23,996	1.09	125,704	12,378	1.10	
Rochester	287,970	19,677	1.07	112,738	9,747	1.09	
Total	18,071,090	1.758.865	1.10	27,606,402	2.363.486	1.09	

 Table 5-4. Privately Owned Vehicle Occupancy, Central and Suburban Counties, 1990

	Centr	al County	Suburb	oan County
Area	POV Drivers	POV Passengers	POV Drivers	POV Passengers
New York City	-2.14	29.15	21.36	14.21
Los Angeles	21.06	27.92	67.41	100.64
Chicago	19.75	-9.88	54.13	5.60
San Francisco	-0.12	-0.90	41.99	50.96
Philadelphia	-6.01	-12.24	32.31	7.77
Detroit	-0.02	-26.67	42.50	21.73
Boston	6.74	-4.65	29.58	-2.84
Washington, DC	-9.43	-32.29	36.46	43.47
Dallas	48.78	25.41	71.13	50.09
Houston	81.07	68.87	117.85	125.76
Miami	57.30	23.31	100.21	77.16
Atlanta	7.19	-26.94	77.97	45.53
Cleveland	4.60	-24.40	29.47	-6.12
Seattle	36.48	26.57	47.39	61.17
San Diego	67.29	74.90		
Minneapolis	27.83	-11.05	53.77	35.12
St. Louis	-11.70	-45.86	31.22	14.72
Baltimore	-1.72	-36.24	49.67	33.09
Pittsburgh	14.18	1.01	27.32	14.67
Phoenix	80.12	83.82		
Tampa	58.66	30.67	89.18	66.01
Denver	15.14	4.06	91.85	135.05
Cincinnati	17.70	-20.39	44.27	5.04
Milwaukee	14.89	-9.00	54.02	30.73
Kansas City	15.14	-16.07	41.29	21.26
Sacramento	44.38	37.51	61.05	88.05
Portland	15.99	4.30	78.96	83.46
Columbus	34.98	-3.64	51.63	35.41
San Antouio	50.51	19.92	91.73	33.89
Indianapolis	23.61	-13.07	49.69	4.45
New Orleans	29.18	-0.89	90.24	72.80
Buffalo	12.11	-14.80	17.42	-16.17
Providence	-6.99	-37.44	25.46	-5.41

 Table 5-5. Privately Owned Vehicle Drivers and Passengers, Percent Change Between 1980-1990

Area	Workers in Area	% POV Drivers	% POV Passenger	% Bus	% Subway /Rail	% Walk	% Taxi	% Motor- cycle	% Bicycle	% Other	% Work @ Home
New York City	6,737,511	50.85	8.18	8.67	20.94	7.86	0.67	0.11	0.31	0.89	1.52
Los Angeles	5,189,055	77.71	9.48	5.01	0.02	3.51	0.05	1.08	0.85	0.76	1.52
Chicago	3,466,377	66.46	9.41	8.84	7.59	5.65	0.21	0.07	0.22	0.35	1.19
San Francisco	2,482,965	69.92	9.16	9.20	2.14	4.39	0.08	0.92	1.25	1.03	1.92
Philadelphia	2,327,057	67.89	10.17	7.04	5.61	6.50	0.07	0.18	0.37	0.60	1.57
Detroit	1,836,510	81.87	9.26	3.50	0.03	3.34	0.13	0.07	0.20	0.54	1.05
Boston	1,614,734	66.12	10.21	7.27	5.62	*	*	*	*	10.78	*
Washington, DC	1,559,820	62.83	13.41	10.62	4.45	4.93	0.38	0.33	0.34	1.02	1.68
Dallas	1,469,079	80.01	11.55	3.34	0.01	2.16	0.06	0.54	0.17	0.80	1.36
Houston	1,508,211	78.82	12.81	2.84	0.01	2.72	0.11	0.44	0.28	0.87	1.10
Miami	1,153,080	78.03	10.51	4.72	0.03	3.15	0.15	0.60	0.78	0.82	1.19
Atlanta	950,030	77.09	11.00	6.71	0.68	1.90	0.16	0.31	0.09	0.86	1.20
Cleveland	1,203,817	77.73	8.73	7.28	0.47	3.70	0.06	0.07	0.13	0.58	1.25
Seattle	976,885	72.99	10.25	8.11	0.01	4.72	0.06	0.77	0.60	0.41	2.07
San Diego	853,666	71.58	9.66	3.20	0.03	9.87	0.07	1.47	1.10	0.97	2.04
Minneapolis	1,046,229	71.87	11.15	8.55	0.01	4.96	0.10	0.19	0.40	0.45	2.33
St. Louis	1,004,504	76.51	12.15	5.57	0.01	3.20	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.49	1.63
Baltimore	968,908	69.14	12.78	9.70	0.25	5.23	0.29	0.31	0.19	0.71	1.40
Pittsburgh	912,880	69.17	10.86	11.31	0.10	6.60	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.47	1.23
Phoenix	658,854	78.62	10.50	1.95	0.01	3.30	0.04	1.62	1.65	0.72	1.60
Tampa	608,999	79.87	10.06	1.67	0.02	3.33	0.08	1.10	0.93	1.38	1.56
Denver	808,019	74.44	11.15	6.04	0.01	4.60	0.10	0.35	0.68	0.57	2.06
Cincinnati	692,424	78.03	10.19	5.59	0.01	3.98	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.48	1.35
Milwaukee	720,308	74.13	10.40	6.98	0.03	5.74	0.08	0.25	0.33	0.48	1.58
Kansas City	620,092	78.47	11.97	3.94	0.01	2.59	0.11	0.19	0.11	0.94	1.67
Sacramento	435,089	76.94	9.71	3.49	0.01	3.44	0.02	1.08	2.65	0.66	2.01
Portland	568,916	73.54	9.74	8.34	0.01	4.15	0.06	0.70	0.60	0.67	2.20
Columbus	488,303	78.60	9.89	4.51	0.01	4.30	0.11	0.14	0.36	0.53	1.54
San Antonio	449,090	75.82	11.20	4.51	0.00	5.39	0.06	0.61	0.33	0.65	1.42
Indianapolis	577,759	79.59	11.56	2.83	0.00	3.12	0.15	0.14	0.01	0.98	1.62
New Orleans	484,155	70.74	11.65	10.55	0.01	3.92	0.34	0.48	0.48	0.76	1.05
Buffalo	499,842	75.09	10.23	6.30	0.01	5.93	0.26	0.10	0.30	0.28	1.50
Providence	486,604	74.97	12.22	3.70	0.17	*	*	*	*	8.94	*
Total	45,359,772	70.31	10.11	6.71	4.49	4.67	0.20	0.42	0.47	1.17	1.45

Table 5-6. Journey to Work by Mode, 1980

\* Boston and Providence data not available for mode split, other captures walk, taxi, motorcycle, bicycle, other and work at home.

Area	Workers in Area	% POV Driver	% POV Passenger	% Bus	% Subway /Rail	% Walk	% Taxi	% Motor- cycle	% Bicycle	% Other	% Work @ Home
New York City	8,037,960	56.94	5.74	8.03	18.82	6.54	0.78	0.06	0.24	0.54	2.32
Los Angeles	6,808,483	79.26	8.54	4.49	0.03	2.94	0.04	0.51	0.71	0.75	2.73
Chicago	3,841,166	72.87	6.52	6.81	6.57	4.01	0.27	0.05	0.21	0.57	2.10
San Francisco	3,196,799	74.22	7.18	6.27	2.82	3.64	0.08	0.54	1.09	0.66	3.49
Philadelphia	29794,655	74.70	6.58	5.97	4.13	5.26	0.08	0.10	0.33	0.60	2.26
Detroit	2,079,795	87.38	5.37	2.30	0.01	2.41	0.11	0.05	0.18	0.43	1.76
Boston	2,139,896	74.90	5.55	4.87	5.48	5.47	0.22	0.07	0.43	0.51	2.51
Washington, DC	2,214,311	69.72	9.00	6.66	6.68	3.85	0.31	0.12	0.30	0.52	2.84
Dallas	1,976,562	85.01	7.50	2.25	0.01	1.86	0.09	0.19	0.13	0.66	2.28
Houston	1,759,752	82.62	8.01	3.65	0.02	2.26	0.11	0.20	0.29	0.78	2.07
Miami	1,476,040	81.95	7.82	3.64	0.57	2.25	0.13	0.21	0.55	0.89	1.97
Atlanta	1,481,736	83.82	6.89	3.54	1.05	1.45	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.69	2.24
Cleveland	1242,042	84.41	5.43	4.21	0.28	2.98	0.06	0.06	0.13	0.48	1.96
Seattle	1,307,226	79.00	6.45	6.16	0.02	3.53	0.06	0.32	0.52	0.59	3.36
San Diego	1,230,333	77.24	7.43	3.16	0.04	4.53	0.07	0.68	0.88	1.00	4.98
Minneapolis	1,307,595	81.20	6.01	5.19	0.01	3.22	0.08	0.09	0.42	0.39	3.40
St. Louis	1,144,305	85.23	6.57	2.82	0.01	2.15	0.14	0.07	0.12	0.53	2.37
Baltimore	1,191,775	77.29	7.83	6.26	1.13	4.05	0.26	0.13	0.15	0.61	2.29
Pittsburgh	956,134	77.36	6.86	7.67	0.20	5.08	0.08	0.06	0.12	0.51	2.07
Phoenix	996,460	81.70	7.72	2.00	0.01	2.65	0.11	0.73	1.40	0.74	2.94
Tampa	914,654	84.99	7.10	1.31	0.02	2.27	0.13	0.39	0.73	0.80	2.27
Denver	964,881	80.79	6.62	4.16	0.02	3.28	0.06	0.20	0.72	0.54	3.60
Cincinnati	812,738	84.54	6.09	3.55	0.01	2.99	0.10	0.07	0.10	0.46	2.10
Milwaukee	772,727	82.32	5.79	4.79	0.03	3.95	0.06	0.12	0.28	0.43	2.24
Kansas City	771,301	85.66	6.74	2.02	0.01	1.89	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.61	2.77
Sacramento	685,905	81.54	7.36	2.12	0.24	2.68	0.04	0.46	1.81	0.64	3.11
Portland	724,495	79.50	6.57	5.22	0.14	3.27	0.05	0.33	0.61	0.55	3.77
Norfolk	698,900	79.16	7.71	2.03	0.03	3.67	0.12	0.27	0.52	1.15	5.34
Columbus	677,859	84.92	6.00	2.64	0.01	3.25	0.09	0.09	0.24	0.45	2.31
San Antonio	569,125	81.32	8.01	3.61	0.01	3.58	0.05	0.23	0.16	0.75	2.30
Indianapolis	624,950	85.76	6.84	1.95	0.01	2.17	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.53	2.40
New Orleans	514,235	77.86	8.42	6.86	0.01	3.10	0.29	0.17	0.50	1.06	1.73
Buffalo	531,114	82.36	5.93	4.06	0.39	4.38	0.25	0.05	0.21	0.52	1.85
Charlotte	604,814	85.41	7.84	1.69	0.01	2.07	0.14	0.10	0.13	0.72	1.88
Providence	520,103	86.92	5.39	1.90	0.28	3.37	0.04	0.05	0.16	0.48	1.41
Hartford	561,950	84.46	6.17	3.56	0.05	3.04	0.05	0.08	0.16	0.49	1.95
Orlando	557,430	84.25	7.11	1.42	0.02	3.46	0.10	0.43	0.62	0.65	1.95
Salt Lake City	479,315	82.70	7.59	2.94	0.01	2.32	0.02	0.30	0.51	0.51	3.10
Rochester	481,463	83.23	6.11	3.11	0.01	4.34	0.07	0.05	0.22	0.43	2.43
Total	59,650,984	76.57	6.91	4.89	3.84	3.75	0.21	0.21	0.43	0.62	2 56

Table 56A. Journey to Work by Mode, 1990

	Drive A	lone	Vehicle	Pool	Trans	sit	Othe	r	Work at	Home
Area	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
New York City	4,212,768	52.29	830,398	10.31	2,239,776	27.80	587,798	7.30	186,512	2.31
Los Angeles	4,960,888	72.86	1,052,249	15.45	310,563	4.56	299.24 1	4.39	186,102	2.73
Chicago	2,592,012	67.48	459,372	11.96	524,756	13.66	184,365	4.80	80,832	2.10
San Francisco	2,203,208	68.83	416,375	13.01	297.363	9.29	172,322	5.38	111,565	3.49
Philadelphia	1,934,795	69.23	339,504	12.15	284,579	10.18	172,949	6.19	63,090	2.26
Detroit	1,720,149	82.70	209,717	10.08	50,568	2.43	62,790	3.02	36,656	1.76
Boston	1,502,708	70.16	220,185	10.28	227,948	10.64	137,184	6.41	53,692	2.51
Washington, DC	1,396,480	63.07	349,273	15.77	302,35 1	13.65	103,368	4.67	62,878	2.84
Dallas	1,559,416	78.89	273,037	13.81	46,504	2.35	52,533	2.66	45,116	2.28
Houston	1,341,876	76.25	256,399	14.57	66,540	3.78	58,641	3.33	36,340	2.07
Miami	1,114,511	75.50	213,658	14.47	64,240	4.35	54,527	3.69	29,149	1.97
Atlanta	1,156,901	78.08	188,844	12.74	69,822	4.71	32,993	2.23	33,221	2.24
Cleveland	988,796	79.61	127,692	10.28	56,675	4.56	44,535	3.59	24,401	1.96
Seattle	965,417	73.79	155,709	11.90	82,619	6.31	60.614	4.63	43,979	3.36
San Diego	880,634	71.57	169,326	13.76	40,378	3.28	78,823	6.41	61,285	4.98
Minneanolis	994,590	76.06	146,892	11.23	69,125	5.29	52,592	4.02	44,425	3.40
St. Louis	913,303	79.81	137,883	12.05	33,994	2.97	32,004	2.80	27,152	2.37
Baltimore	846,322	71.01	169,695	14.24	91,176	7.65	57,344	4.81	27,276	2.29
Pittsburgh	683,409	71.47	122,414	12.80	75,995	7.95	54,537	5.70	19,808	2.07
Phoenix	755,116	75.78	143,170	14.37	21,184	2.13	47,716	4.79	29.309	2.94
Tampa	724,420	79.20	121,420	13.27	13,367	1.46	34,735	3.80	20,769	2.27
Denver	725,366	75.17	120,028	12.44	40,961	4.25	43,790	4.54	34,767	3.60
Cincinnati	644,269	79.27	92,858	11.42	29,758	3.66	28,839	3.55	17,042	2.10
Milwaukee	597,224	77.29	84,502	10.94	37,737	4.88	35.958	4.65	17,331	2.24
Kansas City	616,880	79.98	96,537	12.52	16,504	2.14	20.05 1	2.60	21,337	2.77
Sacramento	519,109	75.68	93,834	13.68	16,462	2.40	35,202	5.13	21,338	3.11
Portland	536,907	74.10	88,975	12.28	39,259	5.42	32,085	4.43	27,306	3.77
Norfolk	5 10,273	73.00	98,754	14.13	15,319	2.19	37,352	5.34	37,301	5.34
Columbus	539,583	79.60	77,347	11.41	18,587	2.74	26,713	3.94	15,629	2.31
San Antonio	425,653	74.79	84,011	14.76	20,870	3.67	25,500	4.48	13,115	2.30
Indianapolis	498,776	79.81	80,393	12.86	12,999	2.08	17,814	2.85	14,989	2.40
New Orleans	365,840	71.07	78,718	15.29	37,337	7.25	23,954	4.65	8,877	1.72
Buffalo	409,7 19	77.14	59,495	11.20	24,943	4.70	27,157	5.11	9,808	1.85
Charlotte	476,962	78.86	87,667	14.49	11,186	1.85	17,651	2.92	11,390	1.88
Providence	428,505	78.62	67,169	12.33	14,116	2.59	25,341	4.65	9,537	1.75
Hartford	446,346	79.43	63,419	11.29	20,567	3.66	20,670	3.68	10,967	1.95
Orlando	437,591	78.50	74,000	13.27	8,617	1.55	26,357	4.73	10,883	1.95
Salt Lake City	367,159	76.60	67,072	13.99	14,266	2.98	15,995	3.34	14,846	3.10
Kochester	374,490	77.78	55,877	11.61	15,372	3.19	24,019	4.99	11,709	2.43
Total	42,368,362	70.96	7 573 868	12.69	5,364,383	8.98	2.866.059	4 80	1 531 729	2 57

Table 5-7. Journey-to-Work Mode Share, 1990

Figure 5-1 illustrates the percentage of all 1990 work trips consisting of drive alone and carpools. The share of those who drive alone ranges from almost 83% in Detroit to just over 52% in New York. In thirty-three of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas 70%-80% of workers drive alone. The areas with the smallest proportion of drive alone commuters have large investments in heavy rail (e.g., New York City, Chicago, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston).

**Carpooling.** Nationally, carpools accounted for just over 13% of all journeys to work in 1990 or 15373,388 workers. The share of carpools remains relatively stable across metropolitan areas, ranging from 10% to 15%. Among the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, Washington, D.C., New Orleans, and Los Angeles had the highest shares of carpool trips (over 15%) while Detroit, Boston, Cleveland and New York had the lowest shares (close to 10%).

The 1990 data (Table 5-8) exposes the term "vehicle pools" (multiple persons traveling together in the same vehicle) as a misnomer. The preponderance of all vehicle pools consist of only two persons. Only in Washington, DC does a four or more person vehicle pool have a notable proportion of work trips (3%). This is reflected in Washington, D.C.'s status as number one among all metropolitan areas in terms of vehicle occupancy, with an average ridership of 1.13.

As is evident in Figure 5-2, Washington, D.C. is also the leader among metropolitan areas in terms of carpooling, with 20% of private vehicle trips used for that purpose. It is possible that well structured public policy and/or incentive programs designed to stimulate Carpool usage made an impact on carpooling decisions. The lowest incidence of carpooling relative to private vehicles was found in Providence, Detroit, and Cleveland, each with under 12% of the workforce using carpools.

**Public Transit (Bus and Rail).** In the U.S., the number of workers using transit for their journey to work has declined almost 25% in the thirty years from 1960 - 1990. As a share of all modes, transit commuters have declined from 12.6% in 1960, to 6.22% in 1980, to 5.12% in 1990. In 1990, nationwide, 5.3% of workers used transit (including taxi), while in large metropolitan areas the figure was 9%.

In 1990, among the metropolitan areas, New York ranked first in share of transit commuters, with 27.8%, followed by Chicago (13.7%) and Washington, D.C. (13.7%). Tampa, Orlando, and Charlotte trailed all other areas in transit usage, each registering less than 2% shares.

Between 1960 and 1970, most metropolitan areas experienced declines in the number of workers using the bus to go to work (Table 5-9). The exceptions, that is metropolitan areas with increases, were New York, Washington, D.C., and Miami.

However, between 1970 and 1980, many metropolitan areas experienced an increase in the number of bus commuters. The rise of transit in the 1970's occurred primarily in the rapidly growing metropolitan areas of the West and South. Federal funding for new transit systems was plentiful during the 1970's and the oil crises years of 1973 and 1979 provided the necessary catalyst for mode shifts to occur. Phoenix, San Diego, Portland, Sacramento, and Denver all showed increases of over 100% in the number of bus commuters between 1970 and 1980, more than surpassing the decline between 1960 and 1970. In New York, in the same time period, however, bus commuters declined by 24%.



Figure 5-1. Drive Alone vs. Vehicle Pool Trips - Percent of All Work Trips, 1990

		Area	wide			Central	County	
Area	4 or More	3 People	2 People	Total	4 or More	3 People	2 People	Total
New York City	92,478	109,298	628,622	830,398	8,174	3,830	16,411	28,415
Los Angeles	102,801	151,928	797,520	1,052,249	60,676	93,629	485,265	639,570
Chicago	38,341	59,263	361,768	459,372	28,956	41,885	230,695	301,536
San Francisco	35,560	63,383	3 17,432	416,375	4,327	6,717	32,881	43,925
Philadelphia	24,673	42,318	272,513	339,504	7,167	12,740	64,515	84,422
Detroit	11,092	21,152	177,473	209,717	5,585	10,776	80,197	96,558
Boston	15,902	22,576	181,707	220,185	3,522	3,867	22,257	29,646
Washington, DC	53,216	53,954	242,103	349,273	12,065	23,352	108,479	143,896
Dallas	20,380	35,590	217,067	273,037	10,080	18,511	107,185	135,776
Houston	24,122	33,619	198,658	256,399	18,656	25,444	151,834	195,934
Miami	15,010	25,665	172,983	213,658	11,199	17,174	109,955	138,328
Atlanta	12,697	23,947	152,200	188,844	2,289	4,082	29,076	35,447
Cleveland	5,588	11,785	110,319	127,692	2,649	6,222	57,239	66,110
Seattle	11,184	18,156	126,369	155,709	5,443	10,088	75,728	91,259
San Diego	11,018	21,538	136,770	169,326	11,018	21,538	136,770	169,326
Minneapolis	8,862	14,537	123,493	146,892	2,333	4,935	47,621	54,889
St. Louis	11,902	15,335	110,646	137,883	1,457	2,489	18,443	22,389
Baltimore	16,019	22,454	131,222	169,695	5,946	8,112	37,634	51,692
Pittsburgh	6,903	14,367	101,144	122,414	3,763	8,977	64,823	77,563
Phoenix	8,366	17,173	117,631	143.170	8,366	17,173	117,631	143,170
Tampa	7,290	12,946	101,184	121,420	4,068	6,225	45,312	55,605
Denver	6,066	12,613	101,349	120,028	1,677	3,564	25,036	30,277
Cincinnati	4,815	10,301	77,742	92,858	2,283	5,069	36,429	43,781
Milwaukee	3,781	8,479	72,242	84,502	2,357	5,285	44,897	52,539
Kansas City	6,227	11,266	79,044	96,537	2,788	4,999	33,450	41,237
Sacramento	6,015	10,893	76,926	93,834	4,069	7,679	55,614	67,362
Portland	5,058	9,928	73,989	88,975	1,861	4,321	30,751	36,933
Norfolk	8,163	12,010	78,581	98,754	1,344	2,233	14,518	18,095
Columbus	2,884	7,490	66,973	77.347	1,755	5,200	47,537	54,492
San Antonio	6,307	10,302	67,402	84,011	5,784	9,258	61,009	76,05 1
Indianapolis	3,854	9,039	67,506	80,393	2.412	5,819	44,691	52,922
New Orleans	7,388	10,570	60,760	78.718	2,515	4,197	22,110	28,822
Buffalo	2,598	6,008	50,889	59,495	2,146	5,087	41,941	49,174
Charlotte	5,723	12,063	69,88 1	87,667	2,031	4,233	28,421	34,685
Providence	3,607	5,985	42,296	51,888	766	1,405	8,556	10,727
Hartford	5,712	6,574	51,133	63,419	923	1,440	6,22 1	8,584
Orlando	4,476	7,907	61,617	74.000	3,061	5,216	39,584	47,861
Salt Lake City	5,289	7,756	54,027	67,072	2,807	4,872	37,056	44,735
Rochester	2,179	5,197	48,501	55,877	1,205	3,266	33,093	37,564
Total	623,546	955,365	5,979,676	7,558,587	259,523	430,909	2,650,865	3,341,297

Table 5-8. Journey to Work by Vehicle Pools, 1990

		Suburban	County		Percent V	ehicle Pool A	reawide	% Drive Alone	% Drive Alone
Area	4 or More	3 People	2 People	Total	4 or More	3 People	2 People	Areawide	Central County
New York City	84,304	105,468	612,211	801,983	1.84	2.17	12.48	83.52	67.53
Los Angeles	42,125	58,299	3 12,255	412,679	1.72	2.54	13.34	82.40	81.85
Chicago	9,385	17,378	131,073	157,836	1.26	1.94	11.86	84.94	82.61
San Francisco	31,233	56,666	284,551	372,450	1.37	2.44	12.20	84.00	77.02
Philadelphia	17,506	29,578	207,998	255,082	1.09	1.86	12.00	85.05	77.21
Detroit	5,507	10,376	97,276	113,159	0.58	1.10	9.20	89.13	87.06
Boston	12,380	18,709	159,450	190,539	0.92	1.31	10.56	87.21	79.28
Washington, DC	41,151	30,602	133,624	205,377	3.05	3.10	13.89	79.96	74.40
Dallas	10,300	17,079	109,882	137,261	1.11	1.95	11.87	85.07	84.11
Houston	. 5,466	8,175	46,824	60,465	1.51	2.11	12.46	83.92	83.91
Miami	3,811	8,491	63,028	75,330	1.13	1.94	13.05	83.88	82.29
Atlanta	10,408	19,865	123,124	153,397	0.94	1.78	11.32	85.95	86.16
Cleveland	2,939	5,563	53,080	61,582	0.50	1.06	9.89	88.56	87.59
Seattle	5,741	8,068	50,641	64,450	1.00	1.63	11.31	86.06	86.30
San Diego					1.06	2.07	13.13	83.74	83.74
Minneapolis	6,529	9,602	75,872	92,003	0.78	1.27	10.83	87.12	88.36
St. Louis	10,445	12,846	92,203	115,494	1.13	1.46	10.53	86.87	82.47
Baltimore	10,073	14,342	93,588	118,003	1.58	2.21	12.94	83.27	75.17
Pittsburgh	3,140	5,390	36,321	44,851	0.86	1.78	12.56	84.80	83.66
Phoenix					0.94	1.93	13.20	83.93	83.93
Tampa	3,222	6,721	55,872	65,815	0.87	1.54	12.01	85.58	85.30
Denver	4,389	9,049	76,313	89,751	0.72	1.50	12.02	85.77	83.98
Cincinnati	2,532	5,232	41,313	49,077	0.65	1.40	10.55	87.39	87.55
Milwaukee	1,424	3,194	27,345	31,963	0.56	1.25	10.61	87.59	85.86
Kansas City	3,439	6,267	45,594	55,300	0.87	1.58	11.09	86.45	85.03
Sacramento	1,946	3,214	21,312	26,472	0.99	1.79	12.61	84.61	84.44
Portland	3,197	5,607	43,238	52,042	0.81	1.59	11.87	85.73	83.99
Norfolk	6,819	9,777	64,063	80,659	1.34	1.98	12.94	83.74	80.16
Columbus	1,129	2,290	19,436	22,855	0.47	1.22	10.87	87.45	87.58
San Antonio	523	1,044	6,393	7,960	1.24	2.03	13.26	83.47	83.46
Indianapolis	1,442	3,220	22,809	27,47 1	0.67	1.56	11.66	86.11	85.45
New Orleans	4,873	6,373	38,650	49,896	1.67	2.38	13.69	82.26	79.16
Buffalo	452	921	8,948	10,321	0.55	1.28	10.85	87.31	87.04
Charlotte	3,692	7,830	41,460	52,982	1.01	2.14	12.39	84.46	86.28
Providence	2,841	4,580	33,740	41,161	0.75	1.25	8.81	86.40	79.46
Hartford	4,789	5,134	44,912	54,835	1.12	1.29	10.04	87.55	77.92
Orlando	1,415	2,691	22,033	26,139	0.88	1.55	12.10	85.47	85.04
Salt Lake City	2,482	2,884	16,971	22,337	1.22	1.79	12.48	84.50	84.82
Rochester	974	1,931	15,408	18,313	0.51	1.21	11.28	87.01	87.79
Total	364,023	524,456	3,328,811	4,217,290	1.04	1.60	10.02	84.80	83.00

Table 5-8. Journey to Work by Vehicle Pools, 1990 (Cont.)



	B	us/Streetcar Rider	5	Percent	Change
Area	1960	1970	1980	1960-70	1970-80
New York City	767,035	772,691	584,450	0.7	-24.4
Los Angeles	200,576	155,709	260,224	-22.4	67.1
Chicago	463,943	403,702	306,351	-13.0	-24.1
San Francisco	188,664	191,369	228,324	1.4	19.3
Philadelphia	3 10,047	260,216	163,882	-16.1	-37.0
Detroit	163,111	122,404	64,359	-25.0	-47.4
Boston		134,640	117,391		-12.8
Washington, DC	183,559	190,323	165,646	3.7	-13.0
Dallas	61,506	47,819	49,102	-22.3	2.7
Houston	52,061	42,885	42,759	-17.6	-0.3
Miami	47,638	48,061	54,473	0.9	13.3
Atlanta	65,636	52,218	63,734	-20.4	22.1
Cleveland	163,145	105,633	87,624	-35.3	-17.0
Seattle	52,703	41,614	79,201	-21.0	90.3
San Diego	22,160	13,069	27,308	-41.0	109.0
Minneapolis	78,410	65,798	89,441	-16.1	35.9
St. Louis	119,395	65,995	55,998	44.7	-15.1
Baltimore	118,851	105,642	93,998	-11.1	-11.0
Pittsburgh	148,478	121.076	103,228	-18.5	-14.7
Phoenix	8,656	4,256	12,870	-50.8	202.4
Tampa	16,181	9,976	10,189	-38.3	2.1
Denver	32,585	20,234	48,801	-37.9	141.2
Cincinnati	69,125	42,143	38,708	-39.0	-8.2
Milwaukee	102,254	67,602	50,29 1	-33.9	-25.6
Kansas City	46,470	26,574	24,425	-42.8	-8.1
Sacramento	11,066	6,444	15,166	-41.8	135.4
Portland	30,256	22,818	47,441	-24.6	107.9
Columbus	37,573	27,529	22,033	-26.7	-20.0
San Antonio	24,099	18,237	20,271	-24.3	11.2
Indianapolis	33,916	24,135	16,372	-28.8	-32.2
New Orleans	89,505	71,846	51,085	-19.7	-28.9
Buffalo	74,686	50,029	31,478	-33.0	-37.1
Providence		19,106	17,983		-5.9
Total	3,783,290	3,351,793	3,044,606	-11.4	-9.2

 Table 5-9.
 Journey to Work by Bus, Percent Change Between 1960-1980

	Bus				Transit **		
Area	1980	1990	% Change	1980	1990	% Change	% Change
New York City	593,490	645,104	8.70	1,419,216	1,512,513	6.57	7.20
Los Angeles	260,224	305,631	17.45	1,293	1,812	40.14	17.56
Chicago	306,380	261,659	-14.60	263,374	252,469	-4.14	-9.76
San Francisco	231,385	200,470	-13.36	53,060	90,307	70.20	2.23
Philadelphia	164,156	166,733	1.57	130,434	115,325	-11.58	-4.25
Detroit	64,539	47,855	-25.85	508	244	-51.97	-26.06
Washington, DC	166,972	147,430	-11.70	69,726	148,016	112.28	24.82
Dallas	48,952	44,445	-9.21	180	179	-0.56	-9.18
Houston	42,759	64,197	50.14	144	361	150.69	50.47
Miami	54,473	53,794	-1.25	385	8,420	2,087.01	13.41
Atlanta	63,826	52,471	-17.79	6,431	15,487	140.82	-3.27
Cleveland	87,624	52,330	-40.28	5,686	3,481	-38.78	-40.19
Seattle	79,201	80,548	1.70	141	233	65.25	1.81
San Diego	27,308	38,860	42.30	229	516	125.33	42.99
Minneapolis	89,463	67,864	-24.14	*	*		-24.14
St. Louis	56,026	32,318	-42.32	*	*		-42.32
Baltimore	94,043	74,587	-20.69	2,425	13,462	455.13	-8.73
Pittsburgh	103,984	73,322	-29.49	942	1,919	103.72	-28.29
Phoenix	12,870	19,962	55.10	*	*		55.10
Tampa	10,232	11,941	16.70	118	189	60.17	17.20
Denver	48,785	40,163	-17.67	85	159	87.06	-17.49
Cincinnati	37,433	28,818	-23.01	*	*		-23.01
Milwaukee	50,291	36,996	-26.44	205	235	14.63	-26.27
Kansas City	24,557	15,606	-36.45	*	*		-36.45
Sacramento	15,795	14,519	-8.08	57	1,631	2,761.40	1.88
Portland	48,53 1	37,796	-22.12	43	1,041	2,320.93	-20.05
Norfolk	23,267	14,187	-39.03	141	182	29.08	-38.62
Columbus	22,181	17,925	-19.19	*	*		-19.19
San Antonio	20,27 1	20,528	1.27	*	*		1.27
Indianapolis	16,084	12,201	-24.14	*	*		-24.14
New Orleans	51,539	35,282	-31.54	*	*		-31.54
Buffalo	31,478	21,547	-31.55	64	2.086	3,159.38	-25.07
Charlotte	11,197	10,251	-8.45	*	*		-8.45
Orlando	5,184	7,929	52.95	*	*		52.95
Salt Lake City	18,578	14,077	-24.23	*	*		-24.23
Rochester	2,721	14,977	-30.42	*	*		-30.42
Total	2,985,799	2,784,323	-6.75	1954,887	2,170,267	11.02	0.28

 Table 5-9A. Journey to Work by Public Transit, Percent Change Between 1980-1990

Total \*

The means of transportation data for some areas may show workers using modes of public transportation not available in those areas. This result is largely due to persons who worked during the reference week at a location that was different from their usual workplace.

\*\* Transit is the sum of Bus and Subway/Rail, this does not include all forms of public transportation.

Between 1980 and 1990, twenty-six of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas showed declines in the number of bus commuters (Table 5-9A and Figure 5-3). Of the thirty-three metropolitan areas shown in Table 5-6, all except for Houston showed declines in the share of bus commuters between 1980 and 1990. Cleveland, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Norfolk each lost over 35% in the number of bus commuters. However, some metropolitan areas did experience increases in numbers of workers using the bus. For example, Houston, San Diego, Phoenix, and Orlando each gained 40% or better. Figure 5-4 shows the trends over thirty years.

Figure 5-5 shows rail and subway commuting trends between 1960 and 1990. Trends between 1980 and 1990 are shown in Table 5-9A. Over the last thirty years, major new rail systems have been established in Atlanta (MARTA), San Francisco (BART), and Washington, D.C. (Metro). Smaller systems, mostly light rail, have been established in Sacramento, Miami, Baltimore, Portland, and Buffalo. These new services reflect 2,000 to 11,000 percent increases in workers using rail/subway for their journey to work in the first decade of operation, because the initial number was close to zero.

For older rail systems, such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston, the number of rail/subway commuters has declined over the last thirty years. New York posted a gain in the number of rail/subway commuters between 1980 and 1990, after significant losses between 1970 and 1980. Chicago, on the other hand, posted a small increase between 1970 and 1980, and then posted a small (-4%) loss between 1980 and 1990.

In the U.S. as a whole, rail and subway commuters accounted for about 2% of all workers in 1990, compared to around 4% at the large metropolitan area level. Between 1980 and 1990, there is wide variation in the change in rail/subway commuters, reflecting the introduction of new service or facilities in areas such as Miami, Sacramento, Portland, and Buffalo. Despite these gains, rail/subway commuters remained one percent or less in these four areas.

Only in the New York metropolitan area does rail/subway make up a large proportion of commuters (20.9% in 1980 and 18.8% in 1990). Despite the drop in share between 1980 and 1990, the number of rail/subway commuters increased from 1.4 million in 1980 to 1.5 million in 1990. These 1.5 million workers in the New York metropolitan area represent nearly 65% of the rail/subway commuters nationwide.

In 1990, Washington, D.C. became the nation's third largest metropolitan area market in terms of number of rail/subway commuters. New York is the largest, followed by Chicago. Historically, Philadelphia has been third.

**Working at Home.** In contrast to carpooling and public transit, the share of commuters who worked at home increased nationally from 2.3% in 1980 to 3.0% in 1990. The pattern may reflect factors such as 'telecommuting', and the rise of service oriented jobs, both of which are consistent with working at home.





Figure 5-4. Commuting by Bus/Streetcar to Work - Percent Change, 1960 - 1990



Figure 5-5. Commuting by Rail or Subway to Work - Percent Change, 1960 - 1990

There were more people working at home in 1960 than in 1990, but in the last decade, the number of people working at home increased over 56% nationwide. Figure 5-6 traces the percent change in work at home against the total number of such workers in the thirty-nine metropolitan areas in 1980 and 1990. The percentage of workers who work at home are small, but growing in every metropolitan area.

**Bicycling and Walking to Work.** In the U.S., bicycling formed a less than one half percent share of all work trips in 1990 (Figure 5-7). Walking, on the other hand, claimed approximately 4% of the journeys, somewhat lower than the 5.6% nationally in 1980. Overall, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and San Diego topped the list in combined proportion of work trips by walking and bicycling, with better than 5% shares. Of those who bicycle, however, the highest shares were in Sacramento, Phoenix, and San Francisco.







# **Chapter 6**

# VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AND AVAILABILITY

This chapter examines issues concerning household vehicle availability. Included are overall vehicle volumes and growth rates, incidence and shares of multi-vehicle households, and trends in households without vehicles.

### **Trends in Household Vehicle Ownership**

In 1990, there were over 152 million vehicles in U.S. households, an increase of 17.4% from 1980 and 178% from 1960. While the total number of vehicles continued to grow, the growth in the 1980's was much smaller than the dramatic growth of the 1970's. During the 1980's, the total number of household vehicles increased slightly faster than household formations, but not quite as rapidly as the number of workers. Thus, the growth in vehicles per household exceeded 3% nationally, while vehicles per worker fell by 1.5%. Nationwide, vehicles per household in 1990 stood at 1.66, compared to 1.03 vehicles per household in 1960. Vehicles per worker equaled 1.32 in 1990, compared to 0.85 in 1960.

In 1990, the Census Bureau collected household vehicle data in eight categories, from zero vehicle households up to seven or more vehicle households. Table 6-1 displays households by vehicle availability for the metropolitan areas for 1980 and 1990. The total number of zero vehicle and one vehicle households remained virtually unchanged from 1960 to 1990. The number of households with no vehicles was about 11 million in 1960 and 10 million in 1990. Similarly, there were just over 30 million households with one vehicle in 1960 and again in 1990. In the last thirty years, households with multiple vehicles have become the norm.

In the large metropolitan areas, percent changes in total household vehicles varied widely in the 1980's (Figure 6-1). Some of the fastest growing areas were Orlando, Atlanta, and Cincinnati. Even in the older, industrial areas of the Northeast and Midwest where there were declines in population, the number of vehicles continued to increase. For example, Pittsburgh, with a 7.5% decline in population, had a 5% increase in vehicles.

The analysis of total vehicles and changing relative household shares is useful in understanding such patterns as urban congestion, local economic conditions, and mode choice decisions. Figure 6-2, for instance, examines vehicles per square mile, and assesses vehicle densities across the thirty-nine metropolitan areas. The New York metropolitan area is clearly the most dense, having over 900 household vehicles per square mile of land, while Salt Lake City and Rochester are among the least dense, with approximately 100 vehicles per square mile.

A closer examination of vehicle growth may be seen in Table 6-2 and 6-2A, where central county and suburban county rates are listed separately for four household classifications. In the 1960-1980 period (Table 6-2), higher suburban vehicle growth rates paralleled the patterns of population and worker growth which occurred in suburban areas during the '60s and '70s.

	0 Vehicle Households		1 Vehicle Households		2 Vehicle Households		3+ Vehicles Households	
Area	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
New York City	2,069,662	1,981,582	2,096,108	1,997,100	1,434,177	1,583,468	523,569	703.714
Los Angeles	425,594	436,773	1,521,737	1,649,594	1,355,443	1,835,083	828,323	979.270
Chicago	525,908	481,943	1,077,418	1,030,125	863,791	1,008,472	299,727	387,523
San Francisco	246,591	241,975	730,311	754,819	666,773	853,276	398,667	479,738
Philadelphia	370,636	364,856	741.099	749,712	622,080	751,861	236,259	287,675
Detroit	191,584	209,583	579,999	564,95 1	594,728	647,561	278,766	301,383
Boston		228,010		547,476		555,154		216,472
Washington, DC	158.287	173,181	436,679	483,983	392,591	536,559	178.709	265,635
Dallas	69,608	92,322	354,042	507,132	394,760	603,651	241,717	246,767
Houston	78,551	110,538	387,176	493,520	406,177	535,013	224,449	192,774
Miami	151,722	165.276	450,209	490,145	309,337	412,991	116,079	
Atlanta	83,967	93.785	243.896	315,708	276,883	421,485	158,341	225,449
Cleveland	127.146	131,506	376,615	362,038	362,831	389,154	152,692	174,955
Seattle	77,386	79,250	261,937	315,429	271,055	389,209	181,816	218,269
San Diego	62,055	70,337	244,886	302,648	221,374	343,476	141,779	170,942
Minneapolis	82,959	85,569	270,877	293,920	279,351	387,530	136,692	168,497
St. Louis	104,163	100,461	301,454	310,880	308,807	361,693	130,390	151,699
Baltimore	138,577	144,015	271.570	278,08 1	252,211	316,701	103,472	141,348
Pittsburgh	155,368	147,511	357.977	335,520	275,963	303,017	95.762	105,875
Phoenix	32,478	57,626	206,700	317.181	186,887	315,529	118.694	117,224
Tampa	72,861	79,324	312,043	385,903	194,292	303,924	77,455	100,330
Denver	48,634	57,233	201,311	245.580	214,761	287,240	143,696	147,753
Cincinnati	70,481	76,103	173,345	207,169	175,625	251,164	79.237	118,484
Milwaukee	79,308	80,636	212,603	203.803	194,731	226,481	73,460	90,538
Kansas City	52.503	51,898	180,058	199,107	196,989	245,587	99,462	105,755
Sacramento	34,709	42,533	143,422	181,569	141,501	219,222	96,714	113,124
Portland	56,456	50,631	191,409	185.656	192,374	227,485	125,215	111,759
Norfolk	45,778	48,855	142,764	165,749	140,124	197.504	57,263	81.428
Columbus	44,480	46,597	163,136	175,970	167,510	210,210	74,141	91.758
San Antonio	35,548	45,213	124,931	165,519	120,873	170,396	64,978	69,893
Indianapolis	39,976	42,458	146,706	162,305	158,767	191,388	73,036	83,859
New Orleans	81,920	82,804	164,862	169,78 1	139,010	153,461	53,406	49,132
Buffalo	74,707	75,282	187,121	171,729	136,917	156,952	46,730	57,840
Charlotte	33,321	38,132	109,273	133,933	131,169	174,108	68,581	94,497
Providence		49,083		149,590		160,487		70,620
Hartford		43,139		128.104		164,362		75,955
Orlando	20,326	26,658	98,766	144.027	91,548	167,488	42,003	63,486
Salt Lake City	19,315	21,096	88,160	102.370	104,304	146,243	77,600	77,822
Rochester	41.085	41,841	136,157	127,101	119.993	146,020	44,960	59,513
Total	6,003,650	6395,615	13,686,757	15,504,927	12,095,707	16,350,605	5,843,840	7,351,140

# Table 6-I. Households by Vehicle Availability, 1980-1990





	Central County				Suburban Counties			
Area	0 VEH	1 VEH	2 VEH	3+ VEH	OVEH	1 VEH	2 VEH	3+ VEH
New York City	1.23	2.03	32.20	-7 1.79	10.80	-12.33	141.06	497.80
Los Angeles	3.30	1.35	52.85	488.24	61.80	69.57	224.23	1,477.34
Chicago	-7.23	-12.59	165.31	473.61	-8.62	-3.21	245.60	1,004.69
San Francisco	-15.78	-6.99	90.25	218.91	26.06	18.63	134.09	996.16
Philadelphia	-11.84	-13.08	131.81	330.67	4.79	-7.91	163.38	718.26
Detroit	-11.77	-29.70	69.42	476.16	35.16	2.11	176.35	1,110.66
Washington, DC	-19.79	-0.76	105.19	145.10	82.24	36.04	254.78	1,345.22
Dallas	0.53	37.54	145.69	1,100.38	-26.81	a.43	215.47	1,721.86
Houston	4.89	65.15	118.96	1,416.23	-11.15	34.60	973.94	2.629.71
Miami	70.02	46.70	173.62	848.66	284.49	195.41	383.50	1,335.03
Atlanta	6.14	9.57	88.11	524.43	15.73	57.64	322.87	2,333.71
Cleveland	-10.87	-19.77	87.06	410.76	-7.30	-20.38	146.80	912.25
Seattle	-6.96	1.84	131.24	984.40	-6.67	11.73	19139	1,392.44
San Diego	49.25	40.53	184.03	1,140.19				
Minneapolis	5.04	-9.89	136.68	619.33	4.55	-1.28	254.18	1,364.87
St. Louis	-43.01	-40.40	106.05	208.66	-1.33	-14.79	219.36	1,448.38
Baltimore	-4.68	-18.13	103.79	325.57	25.89	9.10	274.69	1,114.54
Pittsburgh	-10.72	-21.00	140.30	567.16	-19.84	-24.52	201.33	898.48
Phoenix	44.94	89.76	263.49	1,331.43				
Tampa	13.87	36.41	194.65	870.36	69.86	114.42	301.34	1,220.73
Denver	-9.66	5.45	58.09	374.77	83.81	81.27	250.42	1,332.86
Cincinnati	-24.2 1	-16.47	138.24	529.29	-13.08	-21.35	205.87	1,440.09
Milwaukee	-8.53	-18.99	149.80	453.22	2.69	-12.01	231.52	1,053.14
Kansas City	-33.53	-23.84	131.84	765.65	-10.77	-7.93	178.41	1,613.82
Sacramento	37.00	35.38	131.24	752.04	SO.52	37.80	158.20	836.30
Portland	2.72	-8.63	84.23	691.42	38.96	45.90	239.36	1,772.17
Columbus	4.58	5.62	174.41	791.39	-22.50	-22.95	204.13	1,141.16
San Antonio	-4.05	14.04	178.81	1,092.42	-14.43	0.45	233.70	2,908.73
Indianapolis	-18.62	-9.11	132.81	712.72	-15.06	-28.48	233.79	2,054.61
New Orleans	-15.29	-7.66	122.16	364.52	20.36	82.00	379.79	1,753.51
Buffalo	-7.77	-23.02	66.94	640.06	-6.11	-30.81	564.45	622.66

Table 6-2. Households by Vehicle Availability, Percent Change 1960-1980

	Central County			Suburban Counties				
Area	OVEH	1 VEH	2VEH	3+ VEH	OVEH	1 VEH	2 VEH	3+ <b>VEH</b>
New York City	-1.44	12.18	40.11	82.85	-5.31	-5.83	10.23	34.30
Los Angeles	-3.75	1.14	23.86	12.14	30.58	24.88	54.35	26.79
Chicago	-10.76	-6.06	11.97	26.47	11.42	-0.13	22.97	32.06
San Francisco	-9.33	0.11	24.12	22.03	3.52	4.04	28.30	20.26
Philadelphia	-3.59	-5.18	4.47	2.94	2.09	4.54	24.06	23.72
Detroit	5.20	-11.69	-4.27	-3.43	23.79	a.23	18.66	15.32
Washington, DC	-2.38	-5.49	7.17	20.26	27.41	16.28	39.86	50.32
Dallas	30.36	27.42	31.10	-9.75	36.48	66.52	76.88	13.11
Houston	41.60	23.29	25.72	-16.50	36.74	48.69	53.11	-7.53
Miami	-0.3 1	3.71	26.87	36.25	34.27	15.24	42.87	23.97
Atlanta	-3.25	6.42	28.77	38.53	35.44	41.88	58.90	43.17
Cleveland	47.22	-6.60	4.10	11.13	-41.48	0.26	10.35	16.97
Seattle	-0.68	19.22	40.91	17.42	10.37	22.61	47.80	23.76
San Diego	13.35	23.59	55.16	20.57				
Minneapolis	-2.05	4.98	14.99	15.55	11.33	12.07	63.45	28.32
St. Louis	-13.53	-9.50	4.93	1.44	7.85	7.55	18.65	17.57
Baltimore	-1.44	-7.90	7.13	13.60	22.56	9.45	30.20	39.84
Pittsburgh	-6.34	-7.10	11.19	14.07	-1.75	-4.84	8.05	7.08
Phoenix	77.43	53.45	68.83	-1.24				
Tampa	12.53	31.79	54.93	23.82	6.94	20.12	57.52	34.48
Denver	0.49	0.65	5.36	-15.64	56.20	38.87	44.71	7.53
Cincinnati	-2.07	-1.07	11.17	16.43	39.58	64.28	92.65	88.84
Milwaukee	1.27	-6.65	13.52	13.16	4.15	2.65	19.68	31.70
Kansas City	-8.57	2.95	14.38	-1.69	13.59	18.23	31.66	11.14
Sacramento	21.92	26.44	50.67	13.80	24.80	27.08	65.83	22.88
Portland	-12.97	-1.24	25.34	-5.73	-4.79	-4.62	14.41	-12.76
Norfolk	-11.46	-1.84	15.47	9.09	18.41	22.59	46.17	47.70
Columbus	4.19	9.33	28.01	22.75	7.50	3.09	19.89	25.36
San Antonio	25.60	31.02	39.24	0.81	59.82	52.64	58.37	96.64
Indianapolis	5.85	10.46	18.60	5.39	8.11	11.18	23.85	26.28
New Orleans	-8.33	-10.37	-6.02	-10.98	36.31	16.64	18.33	-7.03
Buffalo	-0.50	-9.05	15.11	25.90	8.81	-4.35	12.69	16.30
Charlotte	21.50	32.78	42.62	37.49	8.84	13.81	25.31	37.97
Orlando	25.48	37.31	75.32	35.82	47.70	65.07	97.09	80.86
Salt Lake City	9.50	17.35	38.85	-2.44	8.31	12.86	43.14	5.73
Rochester	1.56	-7.75	19.95	33.07	3.21	-3.36	26.10	30.95

 Table 6-2A. Households by Vehicle Availability, Percent Change 1980-1990

**Average Number of Vehicles Per Household.** Nationally, the average number of vehicles per household increased from 1.03 vehicles in 1960 to 1.66 vehicles in 1990. The trend for the metropolitan areas was slightly lower than nationally, from 1.00 vehicles in 1960 to 1.59 vehicles in 1990. This dramatic increase occurred simultaneously with a decline in average household size; thus, vehicle availability per person has virtually doubled in the last thirty years (Table 2-2).

In 1990, for the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, the average number of vehicles per household ranged from a low of 1.20 vehicles in New York, to 1.88 vehicles in Salt Lake City (Table 3-6). Twenty-three of the thirty-nine metropolitan areas fall in the range of 1.60 to 1.79 vehicles per household. The metropolitan areas with the highest average number of vehicles were, after Salt Lake City, Seattle (1.8 1), Atlanta (1.80), and Charlotte (1.80). The New York metropolitan area had the greatest proportion (3 1.6%) of households without any vehicle, contributing very strongly to the low average.

**Zero Vehicle Households.** Between 1960 and 1980 the absolute number of zero vehicle households declined by one million, then showed a modest increase between 1980 and 1990 for an overall 7% decline. As a share of total households, however, this group declined from 21.5% of households in 1960 to 11.5% in 1990. Within the thirty-nine metropolitan areas, the corresponding share was higher at 14%. The New York metropolitan area in 1990 had 6.9% of the U.S. population and 18% of all households with zero vehicles.

From 1980-1990, seventeen central counties had declines in zero vehicle households. The highest increases in central county households with zero vehicles were concentrated in places like Miami, San Diego, and Phoenix, that had large influxes of immigrants, large retirement populations, or both. This trend seems even more apparent in the suburban counties of these sunbelt metropolitan areas. Figure 6-3 depicts, in graph form, the data for zero vehicle households presented in Table 6-2A.

**One Vehicle Households.** From 1960 to 1990, households with only one vehicle available grew by less than 3%, but like zero vehicle households, the relative share of such households fell by 41%. While in 1960 over half of all households (56.9%) had one vehicle, by 1990 only 34% of households were in this category.

In large metropolitan areas, the central/suburban county split for one vehicle households displays a wide range of values. From 1960-1980, percent changes-in central counties ranged from a low of -40% to a high of 90%. In the 1980's, the numbers began to stabilize, ranging from -10% to 53%. The suburban county households with one vehicle displayed an equally erratic set of percent changes in the years from 1960-1980, ranging from -31% to 195%. Like the central county, this also began to stabilize in the 1980's, with a range of -6% to 66%.

**Two Vehicle Households.** Two vehicle households displayed the strongest and most consistent growth rates among the four categories, rising over 25% nationwide from 1980-1990. The share of households with two vehicles increased from 19% in 1960 to 37% in 1990.



Figure 6-3. Zero Vehicle Households, 1980-1990 - Percent Change, Central and Suburban County

Both central county and suburban county rates of growth have been robust for households with two vehicles. In the 1960-1980 period, central counties of twenty-two metropolitan areas had increases over 100% for two-vehicle households, while suburban counties in six metropolitan areas grew over 300% in the same period. Although the 1980's saw more moderate increases (and decreases in Detroit and New Orleans), both central and suburban counties continued to post gains in the number of households with two vehicles.

**Three or More Vehicle Households.** Nationwide, from 1960-1990, households with three or more vehicles soared from only 2.5% in 1960, to 17.5% in 1980 and 17.3% in 1990. The number of households with three or more vehicles increased from 1.3 million in 1960 to nearly 16 million in 1990. By 1990, many households with three or more vehicles had fewer drivers than vehicles (e.g., three vehicles for two adult drivers).

In central and suburban counties, growth rates in households with three or more vehicles was extremely strong in the 1960's and 1970's, but weakened in the 1980's. Figure 6-4 illustrates contrasting growth rates for the 1980-1990 period for households with three or more vehicles. The highest rates appear to be associated with those metropolitan areas that fared well economically during the 1980's. By comparison, the lowest rates of growth were concentrated in those sunbelt states and metropolitan areas hit hard by energy-related unemployment. This suggests that the acquisition of a third or more household vehicle is often discretionary and is not required by household journey-to-work circumstances.





# Chapter 7

## SELECTED CHANGES BASED ON 1992 GEOGRAPHIC REDEFINITION

The latest publicly available data for the Journey-To-Work components of national transportation statistics are from the 1990 Decennial Census. On December 31, 1992 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) redefined Metropolitan Areas for use in Federal Statistical activities.' These updates are based on population estimates derived from special census population counts. This chapter illustrates, through selected data series, how the new geographic boundaries affect population, worker, and vehicle characteristics described in earlier chapters of the report. Readers should note that none of these revisions are reflected in the metropolitan area maps located in the Profiles section of this report, nor in any of the data tabulations provided.

## **Geographic Boundary Changes**

In 1990, thirty-nine metropolitan areas had populations of at least one million. Eleven of these areas remained unchanged in the OMB revision process. As a result of the new revisions, twenty metropolitan areas showed absolute growth in population from the inclusion of additional counties. Only the Columbus MSA incurred an absolute loss in population from the deletion of a county. Other metropolitan areas had combinations of counties added and subtracted. Within this group, Atlanta displayed a net gain in population, while Philadelphia experienced a net loss. Finally, the Washington MSA and Baltimore MSA have now been combined to form one Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area, incorporating parts of three states and the District of Columbia. The complete list of metropolitan area changes is summarized in Table 7-1.

**Changes in Total Areawide Population and Population Density.** Table 7-2 compares the post-revision population changes in the thirty-nine metropolitan areas. Of those metropolitan areas that lost population, the changes were quite minor, with Columbus dropping 2.3% and Philadelphia about one tenth of a percent. Six metropolitan areas jumped over 10% in population as a direct result of the revision process. In Cincinnati and Portland the change represented an increase of greater than 20%. Cincinnati is an interesting case. Although it is an older, northern city, it displayed some growth patterns normally associated with Sunbelt locations. As such, it is a fine example of a metropolitan area that has successfully managed the conversion from an industrial to a services-driven economy.

Population density was substantially more affected as a result of the revisions. Twenty-three metropolitan areas experienced declines in density as newer, larger, and presumably less populated counties were added to their boundaries (Table 7-3). In Phoenix, for example, density declined by

OMB Bulletin No. 93-05, "Revised Statistical Definitions for Metropolitan Areas," (Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, December 28, 1992).

### Table 7.1 Changes in Metropolitan Areas as a Result of the 1992 OMB Revision<sup>2</sup>

#### Areas that did not change:

Los Angeles San Francisco Miami San Diego Tampa Denver Milwaukee Sacramento Buffalo Charlotte Salt Lake City

### **County changes:**

New York City Dutchess, NY (added) Pike, PA (added) Mercer, NJ (transferred to PHI) Warren, NJ (added)

Chicago DeKalb, IL (added) Kankakee, IL (added)

#### Philadelphia

Atlantic NJ (added) Cape May, NJ (added) Mercer, NJ (transferred to NYC)

### Detroit

Genesee (added) Lenawee (added)

### Dallas

Henderson (added) Hood (added) Hunt (added) Houston Chambers (added)

Atlanta Bartow (added) Carroll (added) Butts (removed)

Cleveland Ashtabula (added)

Seattle Kitsap (added) Thurston (added) Island (added)

Minneapolis Sherbourne, MN (added) Pierce, WI (added)

**St. Louis** Lincoln, MO (added) Warren, MO (added)

Pittsburgh Butler (added)

**Phoenix** Pinal (added)

### Cincinnati

Brown, OH (added) Butler, OH (added) Gallatin, KY (added) Grant, KY (added) Pendleton, KY (added) Ohio, IN (added)

Kansas City Clinton, MO (added) Portland Columbia, OR (added) Marion, OR (added) Polk, OR (added)

Norfolk Island of Wight, VA (added) Mathews, VA (added) Currituck, NC (added)

Columbus Union (removed)

San Antonio Wilson (added)

Indianapolis Madison, IN (added)

New Orleans Plaquemines Parish (added) St James Parish (added)

**Orlando** Lake (added)

Rochester Genesee (added)

Washington-Baltimore (Combined-1992):

Washington, MD (added) Clarke, VA (added) Culpepper, VA (added) Fauquier, VA (added) King George, VA (added) Spotsylvania, VA (added) Warren, VA (added) Berkeley, WV (added) Jefferson, WV (added)

<sup>2</sup> New York City Metropolitan Area excludes New England portion.

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	17,125,727	17,830,586	4.12
Los Angeles	14,531,529	14,531,529	0.00
Chicago	8,065,633	8,239,820	2.16
San Francisco	6,253,311	6,253,311	0.00
Philadelphia	5,899,345	5,892,937	-0.11
Detroit	4,665,236	5,187,171	11.19
Boston	4,171,747	5,455,403	30.77
Washington - Baltimore	6,305,746	6,727,050	6.68
Dallas	3,885,415	4,037,282	3.91
Houston	3,711,043	3,731,131	0.54
Miami	3,192,582	3,192,582	0.00
Atlanta	2,833,511	2,959,950	4.46
Cleveland	2,759,823	2,859,644	3.62
Seattle	2,559,164	2,970,328	16.07
San Diego	2,498,016	2,498,016	0.00
Minneapolis	2,464,124	2,538,834	3.03
St. Louis	2,444,099	2,492,525	1.98
Pittsburgh	2,242,798	2,394,811	6.78
Phoenix	2,122,101	2,238,480	5.48
Tampa	2,067,959	2,067,959	0.00
Denver	1,848,319	1,980,140	7.13
Cincinnati	1,744,124	2,109,050	20.92
Milwaukee	1,607,183	1,607,183	0.00
Kansas City	1,566,280	1,582,875	1.06
Sacramento	1,481,102	1,481,102	0.00
Portland	1,477,895	1,793,476	21.35
Norfolk	1,396,107	1,443,244	3.38
Columbus	1,377,419	1,345,450	-2.32
San Antonio	1,302,099	1,324,749	1.74
Indianapolis	1,249,822	1,380,491	10.46
New Orleans	1,238,816	1,285,270	3.75
Buffalo	1,189,288	1,189,288	0.00
Charlotte	1,162,093	1,162,093	0.00
Providence	1,141,525	1,134,350	-0.63
Hartford	1,085,895	1,157,585	6.60
Orlando	1,072,748	1,224,852	14.18
Salt Lake City	1,072,227	1,072,227	0.00
Rochester	1,002,410	1,062,470	5.99
Total	123,814,261	129,435,244	4.54

# Table 7-2. 1990 Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition
Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	8,057,252	8,403,964	4.30
Los Angeles	6,809,043	6,809,043	0.00
Chicago	3,841,337	3,928,664	2.27
San Francisco	3,200,833	3,200,833	0.00
Philadelphia	2,794,917	2,784,581	-0.37
Detroit	2,079,880	2,325,097	11.79
Boston	2,141,717		
Washington - Baltimore	3,406,163	3,619,254	6.26
Dallas	1,976,606	2,045,034	3.46
Houston	1,759,796	1,769,243	0.54
Miami	1,476,085	1,476,085	0.00
Atlanta	1,481,781	1,542,338	4.09
Cleveland	1,242,099	1,317,728	6.09
Seattle	1,308,338	1,515,183	15.81
San Diego	1,230,446	1,230,446	0.00
Minneapolis	1,307,624	1,347,571	3.05
St. Louis	1,144,336	1,166,023	1.90
Pittsburgh	956,154	1,029,136	7.63
Phoenix	996,495	1,040,962	4.46
Tampa	914,711	914,711	0.00
Denver	964,912	1,026,847	6.42
Cincinnati	812,766	991,939	22.04
Milwaukee	772,752	772,752	0.00
Kansas City	771,309	778,624	0.95
Sacramento	685,945	685,945	0.00
Portland	724,532	873,392	20.55
Norfolk	698,999	722,493	3.36
Columbus	677,859	662,150	-2.32
San Antonio	569,149	579,283	1.78
Indianapolis	624,971	688,229	10.12
New Orleans	514,726	533,845	3.71
Buffalo	531,122	531,122	0.00
Charlotte	604,856	604,856	0.00
Providence	544,668		
Hartford	561,969		
Orlando	557,448	619,039	11.05
Salt Lake City	479,338	479,338	0.00
Rochester	481,467	509,733	5.87
Total	56,456,047	58,525,483	3.67

## Table 7-3. 1990 Worker Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

х Х 33.4% with the addition of Pinal county. Similarly, the population density of New Orleans declined by 30% with the addition of the Plaquemines and St. James parishes. Only Columbus, which had a county removed, posted a gain of 11% in density.

**Changes in Total Areawide Workers.** Table 7-4 shows that the change in workers parallels the population change. In Cincinnati, the percentage change in workers (22%) is one percent greater than the corresponding change in population. Portland also records a gain of 20.5% in its worker base. Six different metropolitan areas show a higher percent gain in workers than they do in population, the most noteworthy being Cleveland where the geographic revision nearly doubled the rate of workers relative to population growth.

Table 7-5 depicts the distribution of worker densities created by the redefinition. In most cases, the changes closely match the changes previously observed in population density. Exceptions include Orlando and Phoenix (worker densities decreased faster than population), and Cleveland and Pittsburgh (population density decreased faster than worker). These disparities, though minor, show how the demographics in an area make a difference in particular calculations. Orlando and Phoenix, as sunbelt locales, generally have a higher incidence of retirees. Pittsburgh and Cleveland, in the heart of the U.S. heavy industry belt, possess a higher incidence of workers. Table 7-6 shows how the new geography affects the proportion of workers relative to the overall population of an area. Eleven metropolitan areas show increases, while eight display declines in the share of workers; Orlando is at the high end of the range (3% rise) while Cleveland is at the low end (2% fall).

**Changes in Total Areawide Vehicle Populations.** In Table 7-7 and Table 7-8 changes in areawide vehicle population and density are fairly consistent with changes in population and workers. Fourteen metropolitan areas have higher rates of vehicle growth than population, while in ten metropolitan areas, vehicles grow at a lower rate. The most noticeable divergences in these two measures appear to be in New York (vehicles increasing at a faster rate than population) and Seattle and Phoenix (vehicles increasing at a slower rate than population). Overall there is a strong accordance between population densities and vehicle densities.

It is evident from Table 7-9 that the added counties have more vehicles per household. As a rule, the growth in households with two or more vehicles is greater than the increase in households with less than two vehicles. The four cities with top growth among the four household vehicle categories are: zero vehicles (16.3% in Orlando); one vehicle (20.3% in Orlando); two vehicles (22.2% in Cincinnati), and three or more vehicles (16.5% in Seattle).

**Changes in Land Area.** Table 7-10 compares the land area in square miles before the new geographic definition and the change in area size after the 1992 geographic definition. The overall effect of the new boundaries is that the densities have been diluted, and in some cases the dilution is considerable. Five metropolitan areas increased their land area by better than 40% as a result of the redefinition in geography: Cincinnati (65.0%), Portland (59.1%), Phoenix (58.3%), New Orleans (47.3%) and Washington/Baltimore (45.5%).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Calculation based on combined land areas before the merger of the two MSA's.

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	52.95	52.87	-0.16
Los Angeles	53.14	53.14	0.00
Chicago	52.37	52.32	-0.10
San Francisco	48.81	48.81	0.00
Philadelphia	52.62	52.75	0.24
Detroit	55.42	55.18	-0.44
Boston	48.66		
Washington - Baltimore	45.98	53.80	17.00
Dallas	49.13	49.35	0.45
Houston	52.58	52.58	0.00
Miami	53.77	53.77	0.00
Atlanta	47.71	52.11	9.23
Cleveland	54.99	53.92	-1.95
Seattle	48.88	48.99	0.23
San Diego	50.74	50.74	0.00
Minneapolis	46.93	46.92	-0.03
St. Louis	53.18	53.22	0.07
Pittsburgh	57.37	57.03	-0.60
Phoenix	53.04	53.50	0.86
Tampa	55.77	55.77	0.00
Denver	47.80	51.86	8.50
Cincinnati	53.40	52.97	-0.81
Milwaukee	51.92	51.92	0.00
Kansas City	50.76	50.81	0.11
Sacramento	53.69	53.69	0.00
Portland	50.98	51.30	0.64
Norfolk	49.93	49.94	0.01
Columbus	50.79	50.79	0.00
San Antonio	56.29	56.27	-0.03
Indianapolis	50.00	50.15	0.30
New Orleans	58.45	58.46	0.02
Buffalo	55.34	55.34	0.00
Charlotte	47.95	47.95	0.00
Providence	52.29		
Hartford	48.25		
Orlando	48.04	49.46	2.97
Salt Lake City	55.30	55.30	0.00
Rochester	51.97	52.02	0.11
Total	57 37	51.01	A 90

Table 7-4. 1990 Workers as a Percent of Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

Table 7-5.	1990 Vehicle	Availability,	1983 &	1992	Geography	Definition
------------	--------------	---------------	--------	------	-----------	------------

	0 V	ehicles Household	5	1 Vehicle Households		
Area	1983	1992	% Change	1983	1992	% Change
New York City	1,981,582	2,006,695	1.27	1,997,100	2,077,695	4.04
Los Angeles	436,773	436,773	0.00	1,649,594	1,649,594	0.00
Chicago	481,943	486,693	0.99	1,030,125	1,051,228	2.05
San Francisco	241,975	241,975	0.00	754,819	754,819	0.00
Philadelphia	364,856	368,303	0.94	749,712	755,717	0.80
Detroit	209,583	229,668	9.58	564,951	630,451	11.59
Boston	228,010			547,476		
Washington - Baltimore	317,196	329,327	3.82	762,064	804,066	5.51
Dallas	92,322	95,893	3.87	507,132	523,586	3.24
Houston	110,538	110,952	0.37	493,520	495,581	0.42
Miami	165,276	165,276	0.00	490,145	490,145	0.00
Atlanta	93,785	96,820	3.24	315,708	328,864	4.17
Cleveland	131,506	134,639	2.38	362,038	374,946	3.57
Seattle	79,250	87,916	10.94	315,429	362,043	14.78
San Diego	70,337	70,337	0.00	302,648	302,648	0.00
Minneapolis	85,569	86,448	1.03	293,920	299,963	2.06
St. Louis	100,461	101,628	1.16	310,880	315,397	1.45
Pittsburgh	147,511	150,751	2.20	335,520	353,498	5.36
Phoenix	57,626	59,420	3.11	317,181	332,371	4.79
Tampa	79,324	79,324	0.00	385,903	385,903	0.00
Denver	57,233	60,025	4.88	245,580	259,600	5.71
Cincinnati	76,103	85,194	11.95	207,169	244,855	18.19
Milwaukee	80,636	80,636	0.00	203,803	203,803	0.00
Kansas City	51,898	52,215	0.61	199,107	200,952	0.93
Sacramento	42,533	42,533	0.00	181,569	181,569	0.00
Portland	50,631	58,647	15.83	185,656	223,332	20.29
Norfolk	48,855	50,262	2.88	165,749	170,586	2.92
Columbus	46,597	46,034	-1.21	175,970	173,080	-1.64
San Antonio	45,213	45,746	1.18	165,519	167,614	1.27
Indianapolis	42,458	46,569	9.68	162,305	179,626	10.67
New Orleans	82,804	84,962	2.61	169,781	174,478	2.77
Buffalo	75,282	75,282	0.00	171,729	171,729	0.00
Charlotte	38,132	38,132	0.00	133,933	133,933	0.00
Providence	49,083			149,590		
Hartford	43,139			128,104		
Orlando	26,658	30,993	16.26	144,027	173,307	20.33
Salt Lake City	21,096	21,096	0.00	102,370	102,370	0.00
Rochester	41,841	43,444	3.83	127,101	134,403	5.75
Total	6.075.383	6,200,608	2.06	14,679,757	15,183,752	3.43

	2 V	ehicles Households		3+ Vehicles Households		
Area	1983	1992	% Change	1983	1992	% Change
New York City	1,583,468	1,713,199	8.19	703,714	747,258	6.19
Los Angeles	1,835,083	1,835,083	0.00	979,270	979,270	0.00
Chicago	1,008,472	1,033,599	2.49	387,523	397,752	2.64
San Francisco	853,276	853,276	0.00	479,738	479,738	0.00
Philadelphia	751,861	750,379	-0.20	287,675	286,742	-0.32
Detroit	647,561	720,434	11.25	301,383	325,657	8.05
Boston	555,154			216,472		
Washington - Baltimore	853,260	914,002	7.12	406,983	443,139	8.88
Dallas	603,651	<b>62</b> 8,966	4.19	246,767	257,438	4.32
Houston	535,013	537,950	0.55	192,774	194,192	0.74
Miami	412,991	412,991	0.00	152,385	152,385	0.00
Atlanta	421,485	439,390	4.25	225,449	235,740	4.56
Cleveland	389,154	403,092	3.58	174,955	181,736	3.88
Seattle	389,209	431,211	10.79	218,269	254,313	16.51
San Diego	343,476	343,476	0.00	170,942	170,942	0.00
Minneapolis	387,530	398,557	2.85	168,497	174,870	3.78
St. Louis	361,693	369,001	2.02	151,699	156,103	2.90
Pittsburgh	303,017	324,816	7.19	105,875	116,183	9.74
Phoenix	315,529	329,710	4.49	117,224	118,746	1.30
Tampa	303,924	303,924	0.00	100,330	100,330	0.00
Denver	287,240	306,092	6.56	147,753	159,553	7.99
Cincinnati	251,164	306,905	22.19	118,484	137,703	16.22
Milwaukee	226,481	226,481	0.00	90,538	90,538	0.00
Kansas City	245,587	247,916	0.95	105,755	107,376	1.53
Sacramento	219,222	219,222	0.00	113,124	113,124	0.00
Portland	227,485	273,528	20.24	111,759	135,595	21.33
Norfolk	197,504	204,720	3.65	81,428	85,570	5.09
Columbus	210,210	205,491	-2.24	91,758	88,893	-3.12
San Antonio	170,396	173,591	1.88	69,893	71,532	2.35
Indianapolis	191,388	210,028	9.74	83,859	93,591	11.61
New Orleans	153,461	159,112	3.68	49,132	51,281	4.37
Buffalo	156,952	156,952	0.00	57,840	57,840	0.00
Charlotte	174,108	174,108	0.00	94,497	94,497	0.00
Providence	160,487			70,620		
Hartford	164,362			75,955		
Orlando	167,488	189,243	12.99	63,486	71,732	12.99
Salt Lake City	146,243	146,243	0.00	77,822	77,822	0.00
Rochester	146,020	154,888	6.07	59,513	63,454	6.62
Total	15,470,602	16,097,576	4.05	6,988,093	7,272,635	4.07

#### Table 7-5. 1990 Vehicle Availability, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition (Cont.)

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	7,001	8,934	27.60
Los Angeles	33,966	33,966	0.00
Chicago	5,619	6,931	23.34
San Francisco	7,368	7,368	0.00
Philadelphia	5,346	5,936	11.04
Detroit	5,176	6,566	26.86
Boston	3,105		
Washington - Baltimore	6,576	9,578	45.65
Dallas	6,968	9,105	30.67
Houston	7,107	7,707	8.43
Miami	3,154	3,154	0.00
Atlanta	5,121	6,126	19.62
Cleveland	2,910	3,613	24.15
Seattle	5,892	7,224	22.60
San Diego	4,204	4,204	0.00
Minneapolis	5,051	6,064	20.06
St. Louis	5,331	6,393	19.93
Pittsburgh	3,835	4,624	20.56
Phoenix	9,204	14,574	58.34
Татра	2,554	2,554	0.00
Denver	4,503	8,496	88.66
Cincinnati	2,592	4,277	64.99
Milwaukee	1,793	1,793	0.00
Kansas City	4,988	5,407	8.40
Sacramento	5,094	5,094	0.00
Portland	4,371	6,954	59.09
Norfolk	1,685	2,349	39.36
Columbus	3,579	3,142	-12.20
San Antonio	2,520	3,327	32.04
Indianapolis	3,071	3,523	14.72
New Orleans	2,309	3,400	47.25
Buffalo	1,568	1,568	0.00
Charlotte	3,379	3,379	0.00
Providence	1,081		
Hartford	1,430		
Orlando	2,538	3,491	37.56
Salt Lake City	1,617	1,617	0.00
Rochester	2,932	3,426	16.86
Total	180,923	215,862	19.31

 Table 7-6.
 1990 Land Area (in Square Miles), 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	7,486,292	7,970,044	6.46
Los Angeles	8,551,351	8,551,351	0.00
Chicago	4,325,895	4,431,008	2.43
San Francisco	4,044,506	4,044,506	0.00
Philadelphia	3,202,762	3,202,724	0.00
Detroit	2,854,637	3,145,987	10.21
Boston	2,372,142		
Washington - Baltimore	3,811,628	4,094,429	7.42
Dallas	2,528,765	2,631,063	4.05
Houston	2,199,700	2,212,315	0.57
Miami	1,818,998	1,818,998	0.00
Atlanta	1,902,660	1,985,586	4.36
Cleveland	1,717,698	1,780,859	3.68
Seattle	1,814,135	2,063,698	13.76
San Diego	1,553,709	1,553,709	0.00
Minneapolis	1,625,020	1,674,148	3.02
St. Louis	1,534,873	1,568,539	2.19
Pittsburgh	1,290,942	1,386,534	7.40
Phoenix	1,335,078	1,383,653	3.64
Tampa	1,324,840	1,324,840	0.00
Denver	1,307,645	1,398,309	6.93
Cincinnati	1,100,494	1,313,085	19.32
Milwaukee	955,540	955,540	0.00
Kansas City	1,039,273	1,051,125	1.14
Sacramento	993,322	993,322	0.00
Portland	1,009,431	1,217,852	20.65
Norfolk	829,469	862,407	3.97
Columbus	899,191	877,409	-2.42
San Antonio	736,958	750,852	1.89
Indianapolis	821,816	908,532	10.55
New Orleans	638,839	661,929	3.61
Buffalo	676,505	676,505	0.00
Charlotte	793,989	793,989	0.00
Providence	703,610		•
Hartford	707,480	]	]
Orlando	688,507	788,509	14.52
Salt Lake City	651,669	651,669	0.00
Rochester	615,534	653,577	6.18
Total	68,681,668	71,378,600	3.93

 Table 7-7.
 1990 Vehicle Population, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	2,446	1,996	-18.41
Los Angeles	428	428	0.00
Chicago	1,435	1,189	-17.18
San Francisco	849	849	0.00
Philadelphia	1,104	993	-10.04
Detroit	901	790	-12.35
Boston	1,343		
Washington - Baltimore	959	702	-26.76
Dallas	558	443	-20.48
Houston	522	484	-7.28
Miami	1,012	1,012	0.00
Atlanta	553	483	-12.67
Cleveland	948	792	-16.54
Seattle	434	411	-5.33
San Diego	594	594	0.00
Minneapolis	488	419	-14.18
St. Louis	458	390	-14.96
Pittsburgh	585	518	-11.43
Phoenix	231	154	-33.38
Tampa	810	810	0.00
Denver	410	233	-43.22
Cincinnati	673	493	-26.71
Milwaukee	896	896	0.00
Kansas City	314	293	-6.77
Sacramento	291	291	0.00
Portland	338	258	-23.72
Norfolk	828	614	-25.82
Columbus	385	428	11.25
San Antonio	517	398	-22.95
Indianapolis	407	392	-3.72
New Orleans	537	378	-29.54
Buffalo	759	759	0.00
Charlotte	344	344	0.00
Providence	1,056		
Hartford	759		
Orlando	423	351	-16.99
Salt Lake City	663	663	0.00
Rochester	342	310	-9.30
Total	649	564	-13.14

 Table 7-8.
 1990 Population Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

1 K 1

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	1,151	941	-18.26
Los Angeles	200	200	0.00
Chicago	684	567	-17.08
San Francisco	434	434	0.00
Philadelphia	523	469	-10.28
Detroit	402	354	-11.88
Boston	690		
Washington - Baltimore	518	378	-27.05
Dallas	284	225	-20.82
Houston	248	230	-7.28
Miami	468	468	0.00
Atlanta	289	252	-12.98
Cleveland	427	365	-14.55
Seattle	222	210	-5.54
San Diego	293	293	0.00
Minneapolis	259	222	-14.16
St. Louis	215	182	-15.03
Pittsburgh	249	223	-10.72
Phoenix	108	71	-34.03
Tampa	358	358	0.00
Denver	214	121	-43.59
Cincinnati	314	232	-26.03
Milwaukee	431	431	0.00
Kansas City	155	144	-6.87
Sacramento	135	135	0.00
Portland	166	126	-24.23
Norfolk	415	308	-25.83
Columbus	189	211	11.26
San Antonio	226	174	-22.91
Indianapolis	203	195	-4.01
New Orleans	223	157	-29.56
Buffalo	339	339	0.00
Charlotte	179	179	0.00
Providence	504		
Hartford	393		
Orlando	220	177	-19.27
Salt Lake City	296	296	0.00
Rochester	164	149	-9.40
Total	312	271	-13.11

Table 7-9. 1990 Worker Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

.

Area	1983 Definition	1992 Definition	% Change
New York City	1,069	892	-16.57
Los Angeles	252	252	0.00
Chicago	770	639	-16.96
San Francisco	549	549	0.00
Philadelphia	599	540	-9.95
Detroit	552	479	-13.13
Boston	764		
Washington - Baltimore	580	427	-26.25
Dallas	363	289	-20.38
Houston	309	287	-7.25
Miami	577	577	0.00
Atlanta	372	324	-12.76
Cleveland	590	493	-16.49
Seattle	308	286	-7.21
San Diego	370	370	0.00
Minneapolis	322	276	-14.19
St. Louis	288	245	-14.79
Pittsburgh	337	300	-10.91
Phoenix	145	95	-34.55
Tampa	519	519	0.00
Denver	290	165	-43.32
Cincinnati	425	307	-27.68
Milwaukee	533	533	0.00
Kansas City	208	194	-6.69
Sacramento	195	195	0.00
Portland	231	175	-24.17
Norfolk	492	367	-25.39
Columbus	251	279	11.14
San Antonio	292	226	-22.84
Indianapolis	268	258	-3.64
New Orleans	277	195	-29.63
Buffalo	432	432	0.00
Charlotte	235	235	0.00
Providence	651		ļ
Hartford	495		
Orlando	271	226	-16.74
Salt Lake City	403	403	0.00
Rochester	210	191	-9.14
Total	380	331	-12.89

#### Table 7-10. 1990 Vehicle Density Per Square Mile, 1983 & 1992 Geography Definition

.

**Section P** 

.

# U.S. and Metropolitan Area Maps and Statistical Profiles

,

С ,

# Table P-l. Listing of Metropolitan Areas With Over One Million Inhabitants in 1990 $^{1}$

No.	Metropolitan Area	Page No.
	National Summary Statistics	P-5
1	New YorkNorthern New JerseyLong Island, NYNJ CMSA	P-7
2	Los AngelesAnaheimRiverside, CA CMSA	P-9
3	ChicagoGaryLake County, ILINWI CMSA	P-11
4	San FranciscoOaklandSan Jose, CA CMSA	P-13
5	PhiladelphiaWilmingtonTrenton, PANJDEMD CMSA	P-15
6	DetroitAnn Arbor, MI CMSA	P-17
7	BostonLawrenceSalem, MANH CMSA (NECMA)	P-19
8	Washington, DCMDVA MSA	· · P-21
9	DallasFort Worth, TX CMSA	· · P-23
10	HoustonGalvestonBrazoria, TX CMSA	P-25
11	MiamiFort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	P-27
12	Atlanta, GA MSA	P-29
13	ClevelandAkronLorain, OH CMSA	· · P-31
14	SeattleTacoma, WA CMSA	P-33
15	San Diego, CA MSA	P-35
16	MinneapolisSt, Paul, MNWI MSA	P-37
17	St. Louis, MOIL MSA	P-39
18	Baltimore, MD MSA	P-41
19	PittsburghBeaver Valley, PA CMSA	P-43
20	Phoenix, AZ MSA	P-45
21	TampaSt. PetersburgClearwater, FL MSA	P-47
22	DenverBoulder, CO CMSA	P-49
23	CincinnatiHamilton, OHKYIN CMSA	P-51
24	MilwaukeeRacine, WI CMSA	P-53
25	Kansas City, MOKS MSA	P-55
26	Sacramento, CA MSA	P-57
27	PortlandVancouver, ORWA CMSA	P-59
28	NorfolkVirginia BeachNewport News, VA MSA	P-61
29	Columbus, OH MSA	P-63
30	San Antonio, TX MSA	P-65
31	Indianapolis, IN MSA	P-67
32	New Orleans, LA MSA	P-69
33	BuffaloNiagara Falls, NY CMSA	P-71
34	CharlotteGastoniaRock Hill, NCSC MSA	P-73
35	ProvidencePawtucketFall River, RIMA CMSA	P-75
36	HartfordNew BritainMiddletown, CT CMSA	P-77
37	Orlando, FL MSA	P-79
38	Salt Lake CityOgden, UT MSA	P-81
39	Rochester, NY MSA	P-83

<sup>1</sup> The profile number refers to the area's population rank in 1990.

#### **U.S. AND METROPOLITAN AREA MAPS AND STATISTICAL PROFILES**

The attached series of metropolitan area county boundary maps and statistical profiles are included as a supplement to the main journey to work analysis in earlier chapters. The thirty-nine metropolitan area profiles follow the National Summary. Each of the thirty-nine is presented in order of its population rank in 1990. Preceding each profile is an area and county map drawn using a geographic information system software package<sup>2</sup> and is thus diagramed to scale. The central cities contained within the metropolitan areas boundaries are also shown. For the U.S. summary, a national map is presented showing the location and relative dimensions of each metropolitan area in this study. Readers should also note that in the spatial orientation of these maps, North is generally at the top of the page.

All maps are drawn, and profiles computed, using the OMB geographic definitions assigned in 1983.<sup>3</sup> The data conform to totals published by the Census Bureau. For summary information on how the 1992 geographic revisions affect particular data series, please refer to Chapter 6 in the report. The profiles include many same data series found in the main body of the report, along with additional calculations, ratios, and statistics that readers may find helpful when analyzing commuting patterns for a specific area. Not all these tabulations are presented in the national summary because certain types of aggregation are either not possible or are without meaning at this level.

There are a number of general statistics throughout the Profiles which are self explanatory. It is important, however, to take note of the definitions of persons per household, workers per household and vehicles per household. The meaning of the words "per household" is not consistent throughout these definitions. Persons per household is calculated using persons in household divided by total households. Vehicles per household is calculated using total vehicles in households divided by total households. That is, for persons per household and vehicles per household is calculated using total workers, including persons in group quarters are not included. Workers per household is calculated using total workers, including persons in households and persons in group quarters, divided by total households. The consequence of this definition is that workers per household is slightly overstated because persons in group quarters, by definition, are not in households. In all cases the variation results in an impact of less than 5% and in the majority of cases the difference is less than 3%.

<sup>2</sup> The package used was Transcad.

<sup>3</sup> Readers should take note that in computing some of the data series for New England metropolitan areas (Boston, Providence, and Hartford), the New England County Metropolitan Area (NECMA) definition is used to delineate county boundaries. This was necessary to maintain consistency with other parts of the U.S., since in New England metropolitan areas are defined by cities and towns, and hence leading to only partial county coverage (rather than the complete county coverage that NECMA's provide). Also note that the New York City CMSA does not include the Connecticut portion.



Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Inside 39 Metro Areas % Remainder of Nation % Urban % Rural	248,709,873 49.78 50.22 75.21 24.79	<b>Travel Time</b> Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Nation 39 Metro Areas Remainder of Nation	22.38 25.20 19.30	Journey to Work by Mode National % Drive Alone % Carpooled % Public Transit % Motorcycle % Walk	<b>73.19</b> <b>13.36</b> 5.27 0.21 3.90
Total Households	91,993,582			% Bicycle	0.41
Persons Per Household	2.63	Commute Length		% Other	0.70
Median Household Income		National		% work at none Inside 39 Metro Areas	2.90
Nationwide	\$30 338	% Less Than 15 Minutes	15.87	% Drive Alone	70.75
Inside 39 Metro Areas	\$31.016	% 15 - 29 Minutes	51.64	% Carpooled	12.69
Remainder of Nation	\$29,665	% 30 - 39 Minutes	14.66	% Public Transit	8.98
		% 40 - 59 Minutes	9.01	% Motorcycle	0.21
National Age Characteristics		% 60 Minutes or More	5.86	% Walk	3.76
Median Age	32.90			% Bicycle	0.43
% 15 Years or Less	22.87	Inside 39 Metro Areas		% Other	0.62
% 65 Years or More	12.56	% Less Than 15 Minutes	11.45	% Work at Home	2.57
Square Miles		% 15 - 29 Minutes	49.22	Remainder of Nation	75 01
National Total	3 536 338	% 50 - 59 Minutes	17.48	% Drive Alone	14.00
% Inside 39 Metro Areas	5,550,558	% 60 Minutes or More	7 52	% Public Transit	14.09
% Remainder of Nation	94.73	% of windles of whole	1.52	% Motorcycle	0.20
	,	Remainder of Nation		% Walk	4.06
Workers		% Less Than 15 Minutes	20.63	% Bicycle	0.38
National Total	115,070,274	% 15 - 29 Minutes	54.24	% Other	0.79
% of Population	46.3	% 30 - 39 Minutes	11.62	% Work at Home	3.39
% Male	54.7	% 40 - 59 Minutes	6.04		
% Female	45.3	% 60 Minutes or More	4.07	General Indicators	
Inside 39 Metro Areas	59,704,401			National	
% Inside 39 Metro Areas	51.89			Population/Sq. Mile	70
Remainder of Nation	55,365,873	Time Workers Leave Home		Households/Sq. Mile	26
% Remainder of Nation	48.11	National		Workers/Sq. Mile	33
Hanakald Vakiala Ameilakilida		National 5.00 AM 6.50 AM	26.04	Workers/Household	1.23
National		5:00 AM 8:20 AM	20.04 41.87	Vehicles/Worker	1.00
Total Vehicles	152 380 479	8.30  AM - 9.59  AM	10.28	Workers/Vehicle	0.76
% 0 Vehicles	11.53	All Other Departures	18.85	Inside 39 Metro Areas	0.70
% 1 Vehicles	33.76	Worked at Home	2.96	Population&q. Mile	664
% 2 Vehicles	37.37			Household&q. Mile	245
% 3+ Vehicles	17.34	Inside 39 Metro Areas		Workers&q.Mile	320
Inside 39 Metro Areas		5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	25.49	Workers/Household	1.31
Total Vehicles	72,464,899	7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	42.44	Vehicles/Household	1.59
% 0 Vehicles	14.02	8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	11.57	Vehicles/Worker	1.21
% 1 Vehicles	34.00	All Other Departures	17.93	Workers/Vehicle	0.82
% 2 Vehicles	55.85 16.12	worked at Home	2.57	Remainder of Nation	27
% 3+ Venicies Remainder of Nation	10.12	Remainder of Nation		Households/Sq. Mile	57 14
Total Vehicles	79,915 580	5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	26.63	Workers/Sa. Mile	14
% 0 Vehicles	9.08	7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	41.26	Workers/Household	1.19
% 1 Vehicles	33.52	8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	8.88	Vehicles/Household	1.72
% 2 Vehicles	38.86	All Other Departures	19.84	Vehicles/Worker	1.44
% 3+ Vehicles	18.54	Worked at Home	3.39	Workers/Vehicle	0.69

# Journey-to-Work Profile: National Summary Statistics (1990)



New York - Northern New Jersey - Long Island, NY - NJ CMSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Population % Central County	717,125,727	Mean (in minutes)		Total Household Vehicles 7,486,29	)2 53
% Suburban Counties	91.31	Area	31.11	% 0 Vehicle Households 31.8	,5 87
% Urban	95.71	Central County	28.50	% 2 Vehicle Households 25.2	27
% Rural	4.29	Suburban Counties	31.37	% 3+ Vehicle Households 11.2	23
Tetel Henry halds	6 261 450	Commute Longth			
Portona Dan Household	0,201,459	Commute Length	21.22	Concred Indicators	
Fersons Fer Household	2.07	% 15-29 Minutes	21.25	General mulcators	
Median Household Income		% 30 - 39 Minutes	16.66	Population/Sq. Mile 2,44	46
Areawide	\$37,869	% 40 - 59 Minutes	15.13	Households/Sq. Mile 89	94
Central County	\$32,262	% 60 Minutes or More	16.51	Worker/Sq. Mile, Areawide	
Suburban Counties	\$38,402			By Place of Residence 1,14	40
And Characteristics		Time Workers Leave Home	10.40	By Place of Work 1,14	46
4ge Characteristics	24.20	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	19.49	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County	75
% 15 Vears or Less	54.50 20.49	% 7:00 ANI - 8:29 ANI % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	40.39	By Place of Residence 20,57 By Place of Work 71,47	/ 5 75
% 15 Tears of Less % 65 Years or More	13.08	% All Other Departures	15.82	Workers/Sa Mile Suburban Counties	15
	15.00	% Worked at Home	2.31	By Place of Residence 1.03	37
Square Miles		,		By Place of Work 86	60
Áreawide Total	7,001			Workers/Household 1.2	29
% Central County	0.41	Privately Owned Vehicles (P	OVs)	Vehicles/Household 1.2	20
% Suburban Counties	99.59	(Includes Drive Alone and Ca	rpool)	Vehicles/Worker 0.9	93
				Workers/Vehicle 1.0	08
<b>XX</b> 7 1		Workers Travel by POVs	5,038,702		
Workers		% Travel by POVs	62.54	Control County	
Living in Area	8 057 252	POV Drivers	4 577 141	New York NY	
% of Population	47.00	% POV Drivers	56.81	Suburban Counties	
% Male	53.80	POV Passengers	461,561	New York:	
% Female	46.20	% POV Passengers	5.73	Bronx	
		DOM: 0		Rings	
Living in Central County	754,148	POV Occupancy	1.10	Nassau	
% Work Central County % Work Suburban County	84.30 14.30			Orange	
% Work Out of Area	14.30	Journey to Work by Mode		r utilalli Oueens	
70 Work Out of Alea	1.40	source to work by work		Richmond	
Living in Suburban Counties	7,303,104	Privately Owned Vehicles		Rockland	
% Work Central County	18.69	% Drive Alone	52.36	Suffolk	
% Work Same County	54.61	% Carpool	10.33	Westchester	
% Work Different County	24.53	The second se		New Jersey:	
% Work Out of Area	2.16	1 ransit 0/ Pug	8.02	Bergen	
		% Bus % Subway/Rail	0.03 18.82	Essex Hudson	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Taxi	0.78	Hunterdon	
			0.70	Middlesex	
% Central-Central County	7.89	Other		Monmoutb	
% Central-Suburban County	1.34	% Motorcycle	0.06	Morris	
% Suburban-Central County	16.94	% Walk	6.54	Ocean	
% Within Suburban County	49.50	% Bicycle	0.24	Passaic	
% To Other Suburban County % Work Out of Area	22.24	% Other % Work at Home	0.54	Somerset	
% Work Out of Area	2.09	% work at Home	2.31	Sussex Union	
				Union	



¥

• - 1 - 2 •

ļ

3 P-8

.

à

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside, CA CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
AreaPopulation % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	14,531,529 60.99 39.01 97.44 2.56	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	26.40 26.48 26.29	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	8,551,351 8,91 33.66 37.45 19.98
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	4,909,218 2.91 \$36,711 \$34,965 \$39,441 30.70 23.92 9.80	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	23.81 34.36 17.86 12.01 9.22 29.21 38.45 11.16 18.45 2.73	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Co By Place of Residence By Place of Work	428 145 200 200 unty 1,014 1,066
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	33,966 11.95 88.05	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> (F (Includes Drive Alone and Ca	POVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban C By Place of Residence By Place of Work	Counties 90 82
Workers Living in Area % of Population	6,809,043 46 90	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	5,978,283 87.80 5,396,643 79.26	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.39 1.74 1.26 0.80
% Male % Female Living in Central County	57.10 42.90 4,115,248	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV Occupancy	581,640 8.54	Central County Los Angeles, CA	
<ul><li>% Work Central County</li><li>% Work Suburban County</li><li>% Work Out of Area</li></ul>	94.10 5.02 0.88	Journey to Work by Mode		Suburban Counties California: Orange Ventura	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	2,693,795 15.93 75.74 6.74 1.60	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	72.35 15.45 4.49	Riverside San Bernardino	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.03 0.04		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	56.87 3.03 6.30 29.96 2.67 1.17	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.51 2.94 0.71 0.75 2.73		



Chicago - Gary - Lake County, IL - IN - WI CMSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN-WI CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	8,065,633 63.29 36.71 95.98 4.02	Travel Time Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	28.07 29.44 25.85	Vehicle AvailabilityTotal Household Vehicles4,% 0 Vehicle Households4,% 1 Vehicle Households8,% 2 Vehicle Households8,% 3+ Vehicle Households4,	325,895 16.57 35.42 34.68 13.33
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics	2,903,236 2.72 \$35,916 \$32,673 \$41,508	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	22.73 30.94 18.22 15.33 10.67 28.73	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	1,435 517 684 685
Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	32.30 23.36 11.38 5,619	% 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	39.84 9.96 19.37 2.10	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count	2,506 2,702 ies
% Central County % Suburban Counties	16.83 83.17	Privately Owned Vehicles ( (Includes Drive Alone and C	POVs) arpool)	By Place of Residence By Place of Work	315 277
Workers		% Travel by POVs	5,049,45 T 79.38	Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.32 1.49 1.13
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	3,841,337 47.60 54.50 45.50	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	2,798,921 72.86 250,510 6.52	Workers/Vehicle Central County Cook II	0.89
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	2,369,624 90.63	POV occupancy	1.09	Suburban Counties	
% Work Out of Area	0.75	Journey to Work by Mode		DuPage Grundy	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	1,471,713 26.33 59.35 12.00 2.33	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	67.43 11.96 6.81	Kane Kendall Lake McHenry Will	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	6.57 0.27	Indiana: Lake Porter	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	55.91 5.32 10.09 22.74 4.60 1.35	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.05 4.01 0.21 0.57 2.10	Wisconsin: Kenosha	



4

# Journey-to-Work Profile: San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA (1990)

10.39 32.40 36.62 20.59

432 439

8,186 12,062

> 383 365

1.37 1.73 1.26 0.79

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
<ul><li>Area Population</li><li>% Central County</li><li>% Suburban Counties</li><li>% Urban</li><li>% Rural</li></ul>	6,253,311 11.58 88.42 96.08 3.92	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	25.55 26.88 25.37	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	4,044,506 10.39 32.40 36.62 20.59
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	2,334,992 2.61 \$41,459 \$33,414 \$42,512 33.50 20.68 11.06	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	24.56 34.83 16.82 12.39 7.91 24.02 42.35 12.66 17.48 3.49	General Indicators Population&q. Mile Household&q. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	849 317 432 439 nty 8,186 12,062
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	7,368 0.63 99.37	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car	<b>OVs</b> ) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Co By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ounties 383 365
Workers Living in Area % of Population	3,200,833 51.20	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	2,602,203 81.30 2,372,801 74.13	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.37 1.73 1.26 0.79
<ul> <li>% Male</li> <li>% Female</li> <li>Living in Central County</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> </ul>	55.00 45.00 382,309 80.41 18.75	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	229,402 7.17 1.10	Central County San Francisco, CA Suburban Counties	
<ul> <li>Work Suburban County</li> <li>Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>Work Central County</li> <li>Work Same County</li> <li>Work Same County</li> <li>Work Different County</li> <li>Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	0.84 2,818,524 8.82 72.82 16.93 1.43	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	68.38 13.02 6.27	Alameda Contra Costa Marin Napa San Mateo Santa Clara Santa Cruz Solano	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	2.82 0.08	Sonoma	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	9.60 2.24 7.76 64.12 14.91 1.36	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.54 3.64 1.09 0.66 3.49		



Philadelphia - Wilmington - Trenton, PA - NJ - DE - MD CMSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	5,899,345 26.88 73.12 89.03 10.97	<b>Travel Time</b> Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	24.11 27.40 23.13	Vehicle Availability I'otal Household Vehicles 3 % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	,202,762 16.94 34.80 34.90 13.35
Total Households Persons Per Household	2,151,624 2.66	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes	27.20 35.38	General Indicators	
Median Household Income Areawide Central County	\$35,735 \$24,603	<ul> <li>% 30 - 39 Minutes</li> <li>% 40 - 59 Minutes</li> <li>% 60 Minutes or More</li> </ul>	16.62 12.21 6.33	Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	1,104 402
Suburban Counties Age Characteristics	\$39,827	Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	22.46	Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	523 515
% 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	33.60 21.75 13.29	% 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	45.69 12.38 17.21 2.26	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	4,740
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County	5,346 2,53	Privately Owned Vehicles (P	0Vs)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count By Place of Residence	ies 413
% Suburban Counties	97.47	(Includes Drive Alone and Car	pool)	By Place of Work	383
Workers		% Travel by POVs	81.27	Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.49 1.15
Living in Area % of Population % Male	2,794,917 47.40 53.40	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers	2,087,549 74.69 184.001	Workers/Vehicle	0.87
% Female	46.60	% POV Passengers	6.58	Central County Philadelphia,PA	
Living in Central County , % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	640,577 80.11 18.42	POV occupancy	1.09	Suburban Counties Pennsylvania:	
% Work Out of Area	1.47 2 154 340	Journey to Work by Mode		Bucks Chester Delaware	
% Work Same County % Work Same County	10.87 62.71	% Drive Alone % carp001	69.13 12.15	Montgomery	
% Work Different County % Work Out of Area	20.75 5.67	Transit % Bus	5.97	Burlington Camden	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Kail % Taxi	4.13 0.08	Gloucester Salem	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> </ul>	18.36 4.22 8.38	Other % Motorcycle % Walk	0.10 5.26	Delaware:	
<ul> <li>Within Suburban County</li> <li>To Other Suburban County</li> <li>Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	48.34 16.00 4.71	% Other % Work at Home	0.33 0.60 2.26	Maryland: Cecil	



Demographics and Laud Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County	4,665,236 45.26	Mean (in minutes) Originating in:		Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households	2,854,637
% Suburban Counties	54.74	Area	23.36	% 1 Vehicle Households	32.78
% Urban	88.44	Central County	23.07	% 2 Vehicle Households	37.57
% Rural	11.56	Suburban Counties	23.56	% 3+ Vehicle Households	17.49
Total Households	1,724,767	Commute Length			
Persons Per Household	2.67	% Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes	25.74 39.48	General Indicators	
Median Household Income		% 30 - 39 Minutes	17.85	Population/Sq. Mile	901
Areawide	\$34,729	% 40 - 59 Minutes	10.73	Households/Sq. Mile	333
Central County	\$27,997	% 60 Minutes or More	4.42		
Suburban Counties	\$40,296	Time Workers Leave Home		Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence	402
Age Characteristics		% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	25.01	By Place of Work	402
Median Age	32.80	% 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	39.46		101
% 15 Years or Less	22.99	% 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	11.06	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Co	ounty
% 65 Years or More	11.57	% All Other Departures	22.17	By Place of Residence	1,437
		% Worked at Home	1.76	By Place of Work	1,383
Areawide Total	5 176			Worker/Sa Mile Suburban C	ounties
% Central County	11.87	Privately Owned Vehicles (P	OVs)	By Place of Residence	262
% Suburban Counties	88.13	(Includes Drive Alone and Ca	rpool)	By Place of Work	269
		(	-F )		
		Workers Travel by POVs	1,928,862	Workers/Household	1.21
Workers		% Travel by POVs	92.74	Vehicles/Household	1.66
Living in Area	2 079 880	POV Drivers	1 817 245	Workers/Vehicle	1.57
% of Population	44.60	% POV Drivers	87.37	workers/veniele	0.75
% Male	54.40	POV Passengers	111,617		
% Female	45.60	% POV Passengers	5.37	Central County	
Living in Central County	822,620	POV occupancy	1.06	wayne, Mi	
% Work Central County	77.00	1 5		Suburban Counties	
% Work Suburban County	22.13			Michigan:	
% Work Out of Area	0.87	Journey to Work by Mode		Lapeer Livingston	
Living in Suburban Counties	1,257,260	Privately Owned Vehicles		Macomb	
% Work Central County	16.64	% Drive Alone	82.66	Monroe	
% Work Same County	65.19	% Carpool	10.08	Oakland St. Clair	
% Work Different County % Work Out of Area	14.70	Transit		St. Clair Washtenaw	
% Work Out of Area	5.41	% Bus	2.30	w ashenaw	
		% Subway/Rail	0.01		
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Taxi	0.11		
% Central-Central County	30.45	Other			
% Central-Suburban County	8.75	% Motorcycle	0.05		
% Suburban-Central County	10.06	% Walk	2.41		
% Within Suburban County	39.41	% Bicycle	0.18		
% To Other Suburban County % Work Out of Area	8.92 2.40	% Other % Work at Home	0.43		
/ WOIK Out OI AICa	2.40		1.70		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Detroit-Ann Arbor, MI CMSA (1990)



## Journey-to-Work Profile: Boston-Lawrence-Salem, MA-NH CMSA (1990)

24.25 24.95 24.14

27.70 33.40 17.38 12.62 6.40

22.00 45.54 13.12 16.84 2.51

1,721,420 80.38

1,602,738 74.83 118,682 5.54 1.07

> 70.15 10.29

> > 4.87 5.48 0.22

0.07 5.47 0.43 0.51 **2.5** 1

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	4,171,747 13.77 86.23 87.08 12.92	<b>Travel Time</b> Clean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties
Total Households Persons Per Household	1,545,347 2.61	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes
Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties	\$40,647 \$29.180 \$42.478	<ul><li>% 30 - 39 Minutes</li><li>% 40 - 59 Minutes</li><li>% 60 Minutes or More</li></ul>
Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	33.20 19.75 12.39	Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 659 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	3,105 1.56 98.44	Privately Owned Vehicles (POVs) (Includes Drive Alone and Carpool)
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs 1,7 % Travel by POVs
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	2,141,717 51.30 52.60 47.40	POV Drivers1,60% POV DriversPOV Passengers% POV Passengers
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	324,109 69.95 28.46	POV Occupancy
% Work Out of Area	28.40 1.58	Journey to Work by Mode
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	1,605,854 16.58 63.63 14.79 4.99	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % carpool Transit % Bus
Journey-to-Work Flows (calculated using NECMA definitio	n)	% Subway/Rail % Taxi
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	11.75 4.78 13.80 52.94 12.31 4.42	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home

Ħ

	Vehicle AvailabilityTotal Household Vehicles2,372,142% 0 Vehicle Households14.74% 1 Vehicle Households35.39% 2 Vehicle Households35.88% 3+ Vehicle Households13.99
I	General Indicators
	Population/Sq. Mile1,344Households/Sq. Mile498
	Workers/Sq. Mile, AreawideBy Place of Residence622By Place of Work667
	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central CountyBy Place of Residence6,693By Place of Work10,847
	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban CountiesBy Place of Residence525By Place of Work505
	Workers/Household1.39Vehicles/Household1.54Vehicles/Worker1.11Workers/Vehicle0.90
	<b>Central City, Central County</b> Boston City, Suffolk County, MA
	Suburban Counties CMSA
	Massachusetts: Bristol (pt.) Essex (pt.) Middlesex (pt.) Norfolk (pt.) Plymouth (pt.) Worcester (pt.)
	New Hampshire: Hillsborough (pt.) Rockingham (pt.)
	NECMA Massachusetts: Essex Middlesex Norfolk Plymouth



÷

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Washington, DC-MD-VA MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	3,923,574 15.47 84.53 91.53 8.47	<b>Travel Time</b> Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	29.52 27.05 29.91	Vehicle AvailabilityTotal Household Vehicles2% 0 Vehicle Households2% 1 Vehicle Households%% 2 Vehicle Households%% 3+ Vehicle Households	2,433,697 11.87 33.16 36.77 18.20
Total Households Persons Per Household	1,460,785 2.62	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes	17.45 30.93	General Indicators	
Median Household Income		% 30 - 39 Minutes	20.08	Population/Sq. Mile	989
Areawide	\$46,856	% 40 - 59 Minutes	18.06	Households/Sq. Mile	368
Central County	\$30,727	% 60 Minutes or More	10.65		
Suburban Counties	\$49,807	Time Werkens Lesse Heres		Workers/Sq. Mile. Areawide	5(2)
Ago Characteristics		1 ime workers Leave Home	27.12	By Place of Residence By Place of Work	515
Age Characteristics Median Age	32.40	% 7.00 AM - 8.29 AM	27.12 43.14	By Flace OF WORK	515
% 15 Years or Less	21.05	% 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	13.32	Workers/Sa. Mile. Central County	
% 65 Years or More	8.56	% All Other Departures	13.59	By Place of Residence	4.957
/		% Worked at Home	2.84	By Place of Work	14,678
Square Miles				-	
Areawide Total	3,967			Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count	ies
% Central County	1.55	Privately Owned Vehicles (P	OVs)	By Place of Residence	493
% Suburban Counties	98.45	(Includes Drive Alone and Car	rpool)	By Place of Work	292
		Workers Travel by POVs	1 743 115	Workers/Household	1.52
Workers		% Travel by POVs	78 72	Vehicles/Household	1.52
WORKED		70 Huver by 10 vs	10.12	Vehicles/Worker	1.10
Living in Area	2,214,350	POV Drivers	1,543,801	Workers/Vehicle	0.91
% of Population	56.40	% POV Drivers	69.72		
% Male	52.50	POV Passengers	199,314		
% Female	47.50	% POV Passengers	9.00	Central County	
Living in Control Country	204 429	DOV accuracy	1 12	District of Columbia	
Work Control County	504,428 77 76	POV occupancy	1.15	Suburban Counties	
% Work Suburban County	14 78			Maryland:	
% Work Out of Area	7.46	Journey to Work by Mode		Calvert	
70 WORK Out of Alea	7.40	Journey to Work by Mode		Charles	
Living in Suburban Counties	1,909,922	Privately Owned Vehicles		Frederick	
% Work Central County	23.38	% Drive Alone	62.95	Montgomery	
% Work Same County	47.77	% carp001	15.77	Prime Georges	
% Work Different County	14.02				
% Work Out of Area	14.84	Transit		Virginia:	
		% Bus	6.66	Arlington	
		% Subway/Rail	6.68	Fairfax	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Taxi	0.31	Loudoun	
% Central-Central County	10.60	Other		Stafford	
% Central-Suburban County	2 03	% Motorcycle	0.12	AlexandriaCity	
% Suburban-Central County	20.16	% Walk	3.85	FairfaxCity	
% Within Suburban County	41.20	% Bicycle	0.30	Falls Church City	
% To Other Suburban County	12.09	% Other	0.52	Manassas City	
% Work Out of Area	13.82	% Work at Home	2.84	Manassas Park City	



## Dallas - Fort Worth, TX CMSA

## Journey-to-Work Profile: Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	3,885,415 47.69 52.31 92.61 7.39	<b>Travel 1</b> Mean (in Driginat Area Central Suburb
Total Households Persons Per Household	1,452,215 2.64	Commut % Less
Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	\$32,825 \$31,605 \$33,937 30.50 24,52 8.02	% 15 - % 30 - % 40 - % 60 1 Time W % 5:00 % 7:00 % 8:30 % All % Wo
Areawide Total % Central County	6,968 12.63	Private
% Suburban Counties	87.37	(Include)
Workers		% Tra
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	1,976,606 50.90 54.90 45.10	POV Dr % PO' POV Pa % PO'
Living in Central County % Work Central County	943,146 90.66	POV oc
% Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	7.54 1.80	Journey
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	1,033,460 27.00 64.24 6.70 2.06	Privately % Dri % Carj Transit % Bus
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Sut % Tay
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	43.26 3.60 14.12 33.59 3.50 1.93	Other % Mo % Wa % Bio % Oth % Wo

Travel Time Mean (in minutes) Driginating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	24.05 24.04 24.06	1
Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes	23.71 38.43 19.39	( F
% 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More	11.31 4.88	H
Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	24.64 46.35 9.75 16.97 2.28	v
<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> ( <b>PC</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Carp	DVs) pool)	V
Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	1,828,641 92.5 1	
POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers	1,680,335 85.01 148,306	Ň
% POV Passengers POV occupancy	7.50 1.09	( I
		5 1
Journey to Work by Mode		
Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool	78.70 13.81	
Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail	2.25 0.01	
% Taxi	0.09	
Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.19 1.86 0.13 0.66 2.28	

Vehicle Availability Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	2,528,765 6.37 34.98 41.63 17.02
General Indicators	
Population/Sq. Mile Household/Sq. Mile	558 208
Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	284 275
Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	y 1,072 1,317
Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 170 124
Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.36 1.74 1.28 0.78
<b>Central County</b> Dallas, TX	
Suburban Counties Texas: Collin Denton Ellis Johnson Kaufman Parker Rockwall Tarrant	



Houston - Galveston - Brazoria, TX CMSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA (1990)

2,199,700 8.30 37.06 40.17 14.47

> 522 188

248 248

784 857

> 75 53

1.32 1.65 1.25 0.80

8

Demographics and Land Area Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	3,711,043 75.94 24.06 89.67 10.33	<b>Travel Time</b> Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	26.08 25.79 27.08	Vehicle AvailabilityTotal Household Vehicles2,19% 0 Vehicle Households2% 1 Vehicle Households3+ Vehicle Households% 3+ Vehicle Households
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	1,333,707 2.75 \$31,488 \$30,970 \$33,123 30.50 25.92 7.32	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	22.14 34.96 20.18 13.44 7.21 30.14 42.61 9.04 16.14 2.07	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	7,107 24.33 75.67	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car	POVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Counties By Place of Residence By Place of Work
Workers	1 750 706	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	1,594,796 90.62	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workerr (Vehicles
% of Population % Male % Female	47.40 56.60 43.40	% POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	1,433,911 82.62 140,885 8.01	Central County
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	1,356,196 95.47 3.11	POV occupancy	1.10	Harris, TX Suburban Counties Texas:
% Work Out of Area	1.42 403.600	Journey to Work by Mode		Brazoria Fort Bend Galveston
<ul> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	40.21 54.53 2.56 2.70	% Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	76.06 14.57 3.65	Liberty Montgomery Waller
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.02 0.11	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	73.58 2.39 9.22 12.51 0.59 1.71	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.20 2.26 0.29 0.78 2.07	



Miami - Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA
# Journey-to-Work Profile: Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land AreaTravelArea Population3,192,582Mean% Central County39.33Area% Urban98.87Central% Rural1.13SuburTotal Households1,220,097CommPersons Per Household2.58% LaMedian Household Income% 28,503% 40Areawide\$28,503% 60Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VMedian Age35.50% 57% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65% 65 Years or More16.65% 40% Square Miles3,154PrivarAreawide Total3,154% WorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% 71% of Population46.20% POV 11% Female45.90% 12% Work Central County38.33% DV 11% Work Central County35.51% POV 12% Work Central County35.50% POV 12% Work Central County35.51% POV 12% Work Central County3.55% POV 12% Work Out of Area1.32JourneLiving in Suburban County588,089Privati% Work Out of Area6.67Transi%			
Area Population3,192,582 (0,67)Mean I Origin% Central County39,33 (1,13)Area (0,13)% Urban98.87 (1,13)Centr% Rural1.13SuburTotal Households1,220,097 (2,14)Comm (1,13)Persons Per Household2.58% La (1,13)Median Household Income Areawide\$28,503 (2,6,909)% du (40)Areawide\$28,503 (2,6,909)% du (2,6,909)Suburban County\$30,962Time V (8,5,909)Age Characteristics Median Age35,50 (8,57)% 15 Years or Less20,28 (8,65)% 65 Years or More16,65% 65 Years or More16,65% Suburban County38,33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area (% Of Population % Male1,476,085 (4,500)% Work Central County % Work Central County887,996 (9,071)% Work Central County % Work Central County3,55 (9, 9)% Work Out of Area1,322Living in Suburban County % Work Out of Area3,14 (9, 071)% Work Central County % Work Out of Area3,14 (9, 071)% Work Out of Area1,322Journey-to-Work Plows% S (9, 7)% Central-Central County % Work Out of Area5,24 (9, %	Demographics and Land Area		Travel
% Central County60.67 39.33Origin Area% Urban98.87 98.87Centr 4 Rural1.13Subur 98.87Centr 8.87% Rural1.13Total Households1,220,097 2.58Comm % Le % Le % 15Median Household Income Areawide\$28,503 \$26,909 \$30,962Comm % 60 % 60Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More71000000000000000000000000000000000000	Area Population	3.192.582	Mean (
% Suburban County39.33 39.33Area (Central Suburban County% Rural1.13Total Households1,220,097 2.58Persons Per Household2.58Median Household Income Areawide\$28,503 \$6,303 Central CountyAge Characteristics Median Age35.50 \$6,57 \$6,57 ears or More% Square Miles Areawide Total3,154Areawide Total % Suburban County31,154Workers% 51 \$0,657 \$6,677Living in Area % 67 Population % Work Central County1,476,085 \$6,909 \$1,31 \$6,677Workers1,476,085 \$6,909 \$1,313Living in Central County % Work Cut of Area887,996 \$0,713 \$7,513Living in Suburban County3,557 \$6,713 \$7,723% Work Central County % Work Out of Area57,233 \$7,237Journey-to-Work Plows% 57,233 \$7,234% Central-Central County \$7,23457,233 \$7,234% Central-Suburban County \$7,23452,24% Suburban-Central County \$7,23452,24	% Central County	60.67	Origina
% Urban       98.87       Centri         % Rural       1.13       Subu         % Rural       1.13       Subu         Total Households       1,220,097       Comm         Persons Per Household       2.58       % L4         % Idean Household Income       % 30         Areawide       \$28,503       % 40         Central County       \$30,962         Median Age       35.50       % 57         % 15 Years or Less       20.28       % 88         % 65 Years or More       16.65       % A         % Gentral County       38.33       (Include)         Square Miles       3,154       % Workers         Areawide Total       3,154       % Work         % Central County       61.67       % 71         % Suburban County       38.33       (Include)         Workers       Worka       % 71         Living in Area       1,476,085       % POV 19         % Male       54.10       % POV 19         % Male       54.10       % POV 19         % Work Central County       95.13       % POV 19         % Work Out of Area       1.32       Journe         Living in Suburban County       58	% Suburban County	39.33	Area
No orbanJossofCentral% Rural1.13SuburYo Rural1.13SuburTotal Households1,220,097CommPersons Per Household2.58% LaMedian Household Income% 30Areawide\$28,503% 40Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics% 65% 55Median Age35.50% 67% 15 Years or Less20.28% 8:% 65 Years or More16.65% A% Square Miles31,154%Areawide Total3,154%% Central County38.33(Includ)Workers% 07%Living in Area1,476,085POV 1% Male54.1090 V% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Contral County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County588,089% Work Cout of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban-C	% Urban	98.87	Centre
% Rural1.13SuburTotal Households1,220,097CommPersons Per Household2.58% LaMedian Household Income% 30Areawide\$28,503Central County\$26,909Suburban County\$30,962Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33(IncludeWorkers% TrivalLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County588,089% Work Cut of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban-Central County57.23% Kental-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.	% Ofban	70.07	Celluz
Total Households1,220,097CommPersons Per Household2.58% LeMedian Household Income% 30Areawide\$28,503Central County\$26,909Suburban County\$30,962Age Characteristics% 5:0Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65Median County61.67% Suburban County38.33Workers1.476,085Living in Area1,476,085% Or Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County3.55% Work Cut of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Cut of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban-Central County57.23% Suburban-Central County57.23% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24 <td>% Kurai</td> <td>1.15</td> <td>Subur</td>	% Kurai	1.15	Subur
Persons Per Household2.58% La % 15Median Household Income Areawide\$28,503% 40Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics Median Age35.50% 7: % 55Median Age35.50% 7: % 55% 65 Years or Less20.28% 8: % 65 Years or More16.65Square Miles Areawide Total3,154% % WSquare Miles Areawide Total3,154Privai (Include)Morkers61.67WorkersLiving in Area1,476,085POV 1 % POV 1 % Male54.10% Male54.1090V 1 % POV 1 % Work Central County887,996% Work Central County3.55%% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban-Central County57.23% Suburban-Central County57.23% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	Total Households	1.220.097	Commu
Tensolis Ter Household2.36% TexMedian Household Income Areawide\$28,503% 40Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics Median Age% 5.0% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% 65 Years or More16.65% 65 Years or More16.67% Square Miles Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33(Include WorkersLiving in Area % of Population % Female1,476,085 46.20% Work Central County % Work Central County887,996 9.13 3.55% Work Cut of Area1.32Living in Suburban County % Work Cut of Area588,089 6.67Work Same County % Work Out of Area6.67% B % Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban-Central County % Suburban County57.23 5.4% Suburban-Central County % Suburban County57.23 5.4% Suburban-Central County % % T57.23 % Work% Central-Central County % % T57.23 % Work	Persons Per Household	2.58	% I e
Median Household Income% 13Areawide\$28,503% 40Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics% 55Median Age35.50% 7:% 15 Years or Less20.28% 8:% 65 Years or More16.65% ASquare Miles3,154Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33(IncludeWorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Central-Central County57.23% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Uother% N% Central-Central County57.23% Suburban Centry2.14% Suburban Centry57.24% Suburban-Central County57.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	reisons rei mousenoid	2.30	70 LC
Median Household Income% 30Areawide\$28,503Central County\$26,909Suburban County\$30,962Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% A reawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33Workers% of PopulationLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County95.13% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County57.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	Madian Hanashald Income		% 13 0/ 20
Areawide\$28,503% 40Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics% 5:0Median Age35.50% 7:% 15 Years or Less20.28% 8:% 65 Years or More16.65% WSquare Miles3,154Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33Uring in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County95.13% Work Central County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County90.19% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Work Same County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County57.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	Median Household Income	<b>*************</b>	% 50
Central County\$26,909% 60Suburban County\$30,962Time VAge Characteristics% 5:0Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% 65 Years or More16.65% W% WSquare Miles31.54Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33(IncludeWorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County3.55% Work Central County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County588,089% Work Central County80.19% Work Count of Area6.67Work Same County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County57.24% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	Areawide	\$28,503	% 40
Suburban County\$30,962Age Characteristics% 50,962Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% A% WSquare Miles3,154Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County3855% Work Central County3.55% Work Cut of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County88,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County88,089% Work Out of Area6.67Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24	Central County	\$26,909	% 60
Age Characteristics Median AgeTime V % 5% % 15 Years or Less% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% A 	Suburban County	\$30,962	
Age Characteristics% 5%Median Age35.50% 15 Years or Less20.28% 65 Years or More16.65% A% WSquare Miles3,154Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County387,996% Work Central County355% Work Cut of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County887,996% Work Cut of Area6.67Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County57.24% Work% T			Time V
Median Age35.50% 7:% 15 Years or Less20.28% 8:% 65 Years or More16.65% A% WSquare Miles3,154Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33Workers% MaleLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Suburban County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	Age Characteristics		% 5:0
% 15 Years or Less20.28% 8:% 65 Years or More16.65% A% Got Years or More16.65% A% Square Miles3,154% WAreawide Total3,154% W% Central County61.67Privai% Suburban County38.33(Include)Workers% M% ThLiving in Area1,476,085% V% of Population46.20% POV D% Male54.10% OV D% Female45.90% POV DLiving in Central County95.13%% Work Central County3.55Journe% Work Suburban County3.55Journe% Work Out of Area1.32JourneLiving in Suburban County588,089Private% Work Central County80.19% C% Work Out of Area6.67Transi% Work Out of Area6.67Transi% Work Out of Area6.67Transi% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	Median Age	35.50	% 7:0
% 65 Years or More16.65% A % WSquare Miles Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Transi % B% SJourney-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County57.24% Work Out of Area% T	% 15 Years or Less	20.28	% 8:3
Square Miles% WAreawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County96.19% Work Central County13.14% Work Out of Area6.67Journey-to-Work Plows% S% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County2.14% Work Out of Area% T	% 65 Years or More	16.65	% Al
Square Miles Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County96.13% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County588,089% Work Out of Area6.67Transi % B% SMork Out of Area6.67% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County2.14% Suburban County2.14% Suburban Centry57.24% Suburban Centry57.24% Suburban Central County57.24			% We
Areawide Total3,154% Central County61.67% Suburban County38.33WorkersWorkersLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Journey-to-Work Plows% S% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County2.14% Work Out of Area% T	Square Miles		
% Central County61.67 38.33Priva (Includ% Suburban County38.33WorkerWorkers% The % The % of Population% The % POV 14 % POV	Areawide Total	3,154	
% Suburban County38.33(InclustWorkers% TrLiving in Area1,476,085POV I% of Population46.20% PQ% Male54.10POV I% Female45.90% PQLiving in Central County95.13POV I% Work Central County95.13POV I% Work Cut of Area1.32JournLiving in Suburban County588,089Private% Work Central County588,089Private% Work Central County6.67Transi% Work Out of Area6.67Transi% Work Out of Area6.67% SJourney-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	% Central County	61.67	Privat
WorkersWorka % TrLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Female45.90Living in Central County95.13% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Transi % B% SJourney-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	% Suburban County	38.33	(Includ
WorkersWorka % TriLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Journey-to-Work Plows% Transi % S% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24			
Workers% InLiving in Area1,476,085% of Population46.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Female45.90Living in Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% Work% Nother			Worke
Living in Area1,476,085POV I% of Population46.20% Pov% Male54.10POV I% Female45.90% PovLiving in Central County887,996POV I% Work Central County95.13900 I% Work Cut of Area1.32JourneLiving in Suburban County588,089Private% Work Central County588,089Private% Work Central County13.14% D% Work Central County80.19% C% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Work Out of Area6.67% SJourney-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	Workers		% Tr
Normalized1,110,00010000% of Population46.20% Provide% Male54.10POV 10% Female45.90% ProvideLiving in Central County95.13POV 10% Work Central County95.13POV 10% Work Suburban County3.55JournaLiving in Suburban County588,089Private% Work Central County13.14% D% Work Central County80.19% C% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	Living in Area	1 476 085	ρον γ
% Or ropinition70.20% Male54.10% Female45.90% Female45.90% Work Central County887,996% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Uork Out of Area6.67% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	% of Population	46.20	% PC
% Male34.1010 V 1% Female45.90% PotLiving in Central County95.13% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Work Out of Area6.67% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Central County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% Suburban-Central County5.24	% Male	40.20 54.10	
% Female45.90% FeLiving in Central County887,996POV% Work Central County95.1390% Work Suburban County3.553.55% Work Out of Area1.32JournLiving in Suburban County588,089Private% Work Central County13.14% D% Work Central County80.19% C% Work Out of Area6.67Transis% Work Out of Area6.67% SJourney-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% W% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	% Wate	J4.10	
Living in Central County887,996POV% Work Central County95.13% Work Suburban County3.55% Work Out of Area1.32Living in Suburban County588,089% Work Central County13.14% Work Central County80.19% Work Out of Area6.67Work Out of Area6.67Journey-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24	% Female	45.90	% PC
% Work Central County       95.13         % Work Suburban County       3.55         % Work Out of Area       1.32         Living in Suburban County       588,089         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Central County       80.19         % Work Central County       80.19         % Work Out of Area       6.67         Transi       % B         % Work Out of Area       6.67         % Work Out of Area       6.67         % Work Out of Area       % S         Journey-to-Work Plows       % S         % Central-Central County       57.23       Other         % Central-Suburban County       2.14       % M	Living in Central County	887 996	POV (
% Work Central County       3.55         % Work Suburban County       3.55         % Work Out of Area       1.32         Living in Suburban County       588,089         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Central County       80.19         % Work Out of Area       6.67         Transis       % B         % Work Out of Area       6.67         % Uork Out of Area       6.67         % Uork Out of Area       % S         % Uork Out of Area       6.67         % Sourney-to-Work Plows       % T         % Central-Central County       57.23       Other         % Central-Suburban County       2.14       % W         % Suburban-Central County       5.24       % W	% Work Central County	95 13	10, 0
% Work Out of Area       1.32         % Work Out of Area       1.32         Living in Suburban County       588,089         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Central County       13.14         % Work Same County       80.19         % Work Out of Area       6.67         Transis       % B         % Work Out of Area       6.67         Journey-to-Work Plows       % T         % Central-Central County       57.23         % Central-Suburban County       2.14         % Suburban-Central County       5.24	% Work Suburban County	2 55	
70 WOR Out of Area       1.32       Journ         Living in Suburban County       588,089       Private         % Work Central County       13.14       % D         % Work Central County       80.19       % C         % Work Out of Area       6.67       Transi         % B       % S       % S         Journey-to-Work Plows       % T       % Central-Central County         % Central-Suburban County       2.14       % M         % Suburban-Central County       5.24       % W	% Work Out of Area	5.55	Tourse
Living in Suburban County 588,089 Private % Work Central County 13.14 % D % Work Same County 80.19 % C % Work Out of Area 6.67 Transi % B <b>Journey-to-Work Plows</b> % T % Central-Central County 57.23 Other % Central-Suburban County 2.14 % M % Suburban-Central County 5.24 % W	70 WOIK OUL OI AIEa	1.32	Journe
% Work Central County       13.14         % Work Same County       80.19         % Work Out of Area       6.67         % Durney-to-Work Plows       % S         % Central-Central County       57.23         % Central-Suburban County       2.14         % Suburban-Central County       5.24	Living in Suburban County	588 089	Private
% Work Same County       13.14       % D         % Work Same County       80.19       % C         % Work Out of Area       6.67       Transi         % B       % B       % S         Journey-to-Work Plows       % T         % Central-Central County       57.23       Other         % Central-Suburban County       2.14       % M         % Suburban-Central County       5.24       % W	% Work Central County	13 14	% Dr
% Work Out of Area     6.67       % Work Out of Area     6.67       Journey-to-Work Plows     % S       % Central-Central County     57.23       % Central-Suburban County     2.14       % Suburban-Central County     5.24	% Work Same County	20.10	/0 DI % Co
Journey-to-Work Plows     57.23       % Central-Central County     57.23       % Central-Suburban County     2.14       % Suburban-Central County     5.24	% Work Out of Area	6 67	70 Ca
Journey-to-Work Plows       % B         % Central-Central County       57.23         % Central-Suburban County       2.14         % Suburban-Central County       5.24	70 WOIK OUL OF AICa	0.07	Transit
Journey-to-Work Plows       % S         % Central-Central County       57.23         % Central-Suburban County       2.14         % Suburban-Central County       5.24			% Bi
Journey-to-Work Plows% T% Central-Central County57.23% Central-Suburban County2.14% Suburban-Central County5.24% W			% Su
% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	Journey-to-Work Plows		% Ta
% Central-Central County57.23Other% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W			
% Central-Suburban County2.14% M% Suburban-Central County5.24% W	% Central-Central County	57.23	Other
% Suburban-Central County 5.24 % W	% Central-Suburban County	2.14	% M
	% Suburban-Central County	5.24	% W
% Within Suburban County 31.95 % B			0 D'
% Work Out of Area 3.45 % C	% Within Suburban County	31.95	% B1
% W	% Within Suburban County % Work Out of Area	31.95 3.45	% Bi % Oi

Travel Time Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban County	24.06 24.80 22.95	
Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More	22.13 38.49 21.61 11.16 4.63	G Po H
Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	21.55 45.34 14.32 16.81 1.97	W
<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> (I (Includes Drive Alone and Ca	POVs) arpool)	w
Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	1,325,040 89.77	W V V
POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV Occupancy	1,209,623 81.95 115,417 7.82 1.10	W C D S
Journey to Work by Mode		F
Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool	75.29 14.48	
Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi	3.64 0.57 0.13	
Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.21 2.25 0.55 0.89 1.97	

Vehicle Availability Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	1,818,998 13.54 40.15 33.83 12.48
General Indicators	
Population/Sq.Mile Households/Sq. Mile	1,012 387
Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	468 465
Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	457 480
Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Coun By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ties 486 440
Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.21 1.49 1.23 0.81
<b>Central County</b> Dade, FL	
<b>Suburban County</b> Florida: Broward	



P-28

.

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2,833,511 22.90 77.10 80.92 19.08	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	26.04 24.91 26.34	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	1,902,660 8.88 29.88 39.90 21.34
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	1,056,929 2.64 \$36,051 \$29,978 \$37,855 31.40 23.17 7.92	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	20.40 35.49 20.81 14.97 6.10 24.05 45.99 11.51 16.21 2.21	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	553 206 289 297 9 597 1,076
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	5,121 10.32 89.68	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> ( (Includes Drive Alone and Car	POVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cour By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 254 208
Workers Living in Area	1,481,781	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	1,344,050 90.71 1,242,028	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.40 1.80 1.28 0.78
% Male % Female	53.30 46.70	POV Passengers % POV Passengers	102,022 6.89	Central County Fulton, GA	
Work Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area Living in Suburban Counties	315,366 70.18 28.12 1.70 1,166,415	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles	1.08	Suburban Counties Georgia: Barrow Butts Cherokee	
<ul><li>% Work Central County</li><li>% Work Same County</li><li>% Work Different County</li><li>% Work Out of Area</li></ul>	27.74 45.83 23.70 2.73	% Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	77.96 12.74 3.54	Clayton Cobb Cowetta Dekalb Douglas	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	1.05 0.12	Fayette Forsyth Gwinnett	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	14.94 5.99 21.84 36.08 18.65 2.51	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.11 1.45 0.09 0.69 2.24	Henry Newton Paulding Rockdale Spalding Walton	

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Atlanta, GA MSA (1990)



# Cleveland - Akron - Lorain, OH CMSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, OH CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2,759,823 51.17 48.83 90.07 9.93	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.96 22.41 21.52	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	1,717,698 12.43 34.23 36.79 16.54
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age	1,058,648 2.56 \$30,332 \$28,595 \$32,152 34.20	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	27.75 41.00 16.90 9.02 3.36 23.74 42.22	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	948 364 427 434
% 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	22.20 13.89	<ul><li>% 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM</li><li>% All Other Departures</li><li>% Worked at Home</li></ul>	11.37 20.70 1.96	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	y 1,348 1,590
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	2,910 15.75 84.25	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles (P</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Car	OVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	255 218
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	1.115.769 89.83	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.17 1.62 1.38
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	1,242,099 45.00 53.80 46.20	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	1,048,353 84.40 67,416 5.43	Workers/Vehicle	0.72
<ul> <li>Work Central County</li> <li>Work Suburban County</li> </ul>	40.20 617,552 92.89 5.78	POV occupancy	1.06	Cuyahoga, OH Suburban Counties	
% Work Out of Area	1.33	Journey to Work by Mode		Portage summit	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	624,547 23.13 64.87 7.93 4.06	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	79.55 10.28 4.21	Geauga Lake Lorain Medina	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.28 0.06		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	46.18 2.87 11.63 32.62 3.99 2.70	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.06 2.98 0.13 0.48 1.96		

Seattle - Tacoma, WA CMSA



# Journey-to-Work Profile: Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Ve
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2,559,164 58.90 41.10 89.94 10.06	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	24.33 24.16 24.61	Total % ( % 1 % 2 % 3
<ul> <li>Total Households</li> <li>Persons Per Household</li> <li>Median Household Income Areawide</li> <li>Central County</li> <li>Suburban Counties</li> <li>4ge Characteristics</li> <li>Median Age</li> <li>% 15 Years or Less</li> <li>% 65 Years or More</li> <li>Square Miles</li> <li>Areawide T o t a 1</li> <li>% Central County</li> <li>% Suburban Counties</li> </ul>	1,003,337 2.49 \$35,047 \$36,179 \$33,425 32.90 22.27 10.66 5,892 36.09 (2.01	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	23.95 37.81 17.58 11.86 5.45 30.64 36.64 10.13 19.23 3.36	Gend Popu Hous Wor By By Work By Work
% Suburban Counties	63.91	(Includes Drive Alone and Car Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	pool) 1,116,958 85 37	By Wor Vehi
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female Living in Central County % Work Central County	1,308,338 51.10 55.20 44.80 805,782 93.20	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV Occupancy	1,032,699 78.93 84,259 6.44 1.08	Vehi Wor Cen King Sub
<ul> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	5.31 1.49 502,556 27.54 68.73 0.58 3.15	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	73.53 11.91 6.16	Was Pie Sno
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.02 0.06	
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	57.40 3.27 10.58 26.40 0.22 2.13	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.32 3.53 0.52 0.59 3.36	

#### chicle Availability

<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	1,814,135 7.91 31.48 38.84 21.78
General Indicators	
Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	434 170
Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	222 224
Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	379 426
Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cour By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 133 109
Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.30 1.81 1.39 0.72
Central County King, WA	
Suburban Counties Washington: Pierce Snohomish	

T



a start a start

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Urban % Rural Total Households	2,498,016 100.00 95.18 4.82 887,719	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes	22.17 22.17 26.43	Total Household Vehicles1% 0 Vehicle Households1% 1 Vehicle Households% 2 Vehicle Households% 3+ Vehicle Households	,553,709 7.93 34.10 38.71 19.26
Median Household Income Areawide Central County	2.69 \$35,022 \$35,022	% 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home	40.08 16.65 7.91 3.95	General Indicators	
Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	30.80 22.05 10.93	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	31.30 36.80 10.00 16.92 4.98	Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence	<b>594</b> <b>211</b> 293
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County	4,204 100.00	Privately Owned Vehicles (PC (Includes Drive Alone and Car Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	<b>DVs)</b> pool) 1,041,651 84.66	By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	293 287
Workers Living in Area % of Population	1,230,446 49.30	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	950,262 77.23 91,389 7.43 1.10	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.39 1.75 1.26 0.79
% Male % Female	58.30 41.70	Journey to Work by Mode		<b>Central County</b> San Diego, CA	
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Out of Area	1,230,446 96.55 3.45	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi	70.90 13.76 3.16 0.04 0.07	Suburban Counties None	
Journey-to-Work Flows % Central-Central County % Work Out of Area	96.55 3.45	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.68 4.53 0.88 1.00 4.98		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: San Diego, CA MSA (1990)



# Journey-to-Work Profile: Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population	2,464,124	Mean (in minutes)		Total Household Vehicles	1,625,020
% Central County	41.90	Originating in:	• • • • •	% 0 Vehicle Households	9.15
% Suburban Counties	58.10	Area	21.09	% 1 Vehicle Households	31.42
% Urban	89.94	Central County	20.19	% 2 Vehicle Households	41.42
% Kurai	10.00	Suburban Counties	21.77	% 5+ venicie Households	18.01
Total Households	935,760	Commute Length			
Persons Per Household	2.58	% Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes	28.21 42.63	General Indicators	
Median Household Income		% 30 - 39 Minutes	15.33	Population/Sq. Mile	488
Areawide	\$36,564	% 40 - 59 Minutes	7.76	Household&q. Mile	185
Central County	\$35,659	% 60 Minutes or More	2.68		
Suburban Counties	\$37,217			Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide	
		Time Workers Leave Home	05.56	By Place of Residence	259
Age Characteristics	21.60	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM	25.76	By Place of Work	265
% 15 Vears or Less	31.00 23.83	% 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	42.34	Workers/Sa Mile Central Cou	ntv
% 65 Years or More	23.83	% All Other Departures	9.30 19.20	By Place of Residence	1 008
	2.00	% Worked at Home	3.40	By Place of Work	1,000
Square Miles		/			-,
Areawide Total	5,051			Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Co	ounties
% Central County	11.02	Privately Owned Vehicles (P	OVs)	By Place of Residence	166
% Suburban Counties	88.98	(Includes Drive Alone and Ca	rpool)	By Place of Work	141
		Workers Travel by POVs	1 140 202	Workers/Household	1.40
Workers		% Travel by POVs	1,140,292 87 20	Vehicles/Household	1.40
WORKED		70 Haver by 1013	07.20	Vehicles/Worker	1.24
Living in Area	1,307,624	POV Drivers	1,061,730	Workers/Vehicle	0.80
% of Population	53.10	% POV Drivers	81.20		
% Male	52.70	POV Passengers	78,562		
% Female	47.30	% POV Passengers	6.01	Central County	
Living in Central County	561,081	POV occupancy	1.07	riennepin, with	
% Work Central County	85.30			Suburban Counties	
% Work Suburban County	13.54			Minnesota:	
% Work Out of Area	1.16	Journey to Work by Mode		Anoka	
				Carver	
Living in Suburban Counties	746,543	Privately Owned Vehicles	75.07	Chisago	
% Work Central County	27.73	% Drive Alone	/5.9/	Dakota Iconti	
% Work Different County	49.18	% carpoor	11.25	Isaliti Ramsey	
% Work Out of Area	20.74	Transit		Scott	
		% Bus	5.19	Washington	
		% Subway/Rail	0.01	Wright	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Taxi	0.08	XX7' ·	
% Central-Central County	36.60	Other		wisconsin: St. Croix	
% Central-Suburban County	5.81	% Motorcycle	0.09		
% Suburban-Central County	15.83	% Walk	3.22		
% Within Suburban County	28.08	% Bicycle	0.42		
% To Other Suburban County	11.96	% Other	0.39		
% Work Out of Area	1.72	% Work at Home	3.40		



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time	-	Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central City % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2,444,099 16.23 83.77 87.94 12.06	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central City Suburban Counties	23.11 21.96 23.30	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	1,534,873 10.86 33.62 39.11 16.40
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central City Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	923,639 2.59 \$31,706 \$19,458 \$34,079 33.10 23.53 12.81	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 8:30 AM - 959 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	25.37 39.06 18.64 10.63 3.93 28.30 40.85 9.15 19.33 2.37	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central City By Place of Residence By Place of Work	458 173 215 205 2,559 5,082
Areawide Total % Central City % Suburban Counties	5,331 1.16 98.84	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car Workers Travel by POVs	<b>OVs</b> ) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	187 148
Workers Living in Area % of Population	1,144,336 46.80	<ul> <li>% Travel by POVs</li> <li>POV Drivers</li> <li>% POV Drivers</li> </ul>	91.79 975,258 85.22	Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.24 1.66 1.34 0.75
% Female Living in Central City % Work Central City	46.80 158,499 65.73	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	6.57 1.08	Central <b>City</b> St. Louis City, MC <b>Suburban Counties</b>	
<ul> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central City</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	33.48 0.79 985,837 20.66 60.21 17.04 2.09	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % carpool Transit % Bus	79.74 12.05 2.82	Missouri: Franklin Jefferson St. Charles St. Louis Illinois: Clinton Jersey	
Journey-to-Work Flows % Central-Central City % Central-Suburban County % Suburban-Central City % Within Suburban County % To Other Suburban County % Work Out of Area	9.10 4.64 17.80 51.87 14.68 1.91	<ul> <li>% Subway/Rail</li> <li>% Taxi</li> <li>Other</li> <li>% Motorcycle</li> <li>% Walk</li> <li>% Bicycle</li> <li>% Other</li> <li>% Work at Home</li> </ul>	0.01 0.14 0.07 2.15 0.12 0.53 2.37	Madison Monroe St. Clair	

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: St. Louis, MO-IL MSA (1990)



eis P

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central City % Suburban Counties	2,382,172 30.90 69.10	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area	25.97	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households	1,377,931 16.36 31.59
% Urban % Rural	87.18 12.82	Suburban Counties	26.10 25.96	% 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	35.98 16.06
Total Households	879,968	Commute Length		~	
Persons Per Household	2.64	% Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes	21.36 36.87	General Indicators	
Median Household Income	\$36 550	% 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes	18.89 13.43	Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	913 337
Central City	\$24,045	% 60 Minutes or More	7.17	nousenolus/sq. wine	551
Suburban Counties	\$42,141			Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide	
		Time Workers Leave Home	25.40	By Place of Residence	457
Age Characteristics	33 30	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	27.49 42.79	By Place of Work	424
% 15 Yeats or Less	21.73	% 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	42.79	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central City	
% 65 Years or More	11.70	% All Other Departures	16.73	By Place of Residence	3,807
		% Worked at Home	2.29	By Place of Work	4,816
Square Miles	2 (00				
	2,609			Worker&q. Mile, Suburban Cou	inties
% Central City % Suburban Counties	3.10	(Includes Drive Alone and Cat	UVS)	By Place of Work	350
70 Suburban Counties	90.90	(includes Drive Alone and Car	p001)	By Hace of Work	203
		Workers Travel by POVs	1,014,461	Workers/Household	1.35
Workers		% Travel by POVs	85.12	Vehicles/Household	1.57
Lining in Ang	1 101 912	DOM Driver	021 150	Vehicles/Worker	1.16
Living in Area % of Population	1,191,813	POV Drivers	921,156	workers/vehicle	0.86
% Male	53.40	POV Passengers	93.305		
% Female	46.60	% POV Passengers	7.83	Central City Baltimore City, MD	
Living in Central City	307,679	POV occupancy	1.10		
% Work Central City	66.10 20.01			Suburban Counties	
% Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	3.89	Journey to Work by Mode		Anne Arundel Baltimore	
Living in Suburban Counties	884,134	Privately Owned Vehicles		Carroll	
% Work Central City	20.26	% Drive Alone	70.88	Harford	
% Work Same County	51.14	% carp001	14.24	Howard	
% Work Out of Area	13.27	Transit		Queen Anne s	
70 Work Out of Alea	15.54	% Bus	6.26		
		% Subway/Rail	1.13		
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Taxi	0.26		
% Central-Central City	17.01	Other			
% Central-Suburban County	7.75	% Motorcycle	0.13		
% Suburban-Central City % Within Suburban County	15.03	% Walk	4.05		
% To Other Suburban County	57.94 11 33	% Other	0.15		
% Work Out of Area	10.90	% Work at Home	2.29		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Baltimore, MD MSA (1990)



#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2242,798 59.59 40.41 80.92 19.08	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	22.56 23.09 21.68	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	1,290,942 16.54 37.62 33.97 11.87
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	891,071 2.46 \$26,501 \$28,136 \$24,090 36.90 19.41 17.33	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	29.24 37.29 15.76 10.91 4.74 24.55 41.29 11.69 20.39 2.07	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	585 232 249 238 815 915
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	3,835 19.04 80.96	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car	OVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ties 116 79
Workers Living in Area	956,154	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers	805,276 84.22 739,649 77.26	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.07 1.45 1.35 0.74
% Male % Female Living in Central County	42.00 54.10 45.90 595,405	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV Occupancy	65,627 6.86	Central County Allegheny,PA	
<ul><li>% Work Central County</li><li>% Work Suburban County</li><li>% Work Out of Area</li></ul>	93.34 3.90 2.76	Journey to Work by Mode		Suburban Counties Pennsylvania: Beaver Fayette	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	360,749 24.19 63.77 4.83 7.21	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % carp001 Transit % Bus	71.42 12.80 7.67	Washington Westmoreland	
Journey-to-WorkFlows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.20		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	58.13 2.43 9.13 24.06 1.82 4.44	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.06 5.08 0.12 0.51 2.07		



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population %Central County %Urban	2,122,101 100.00 96.38	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area	23.00	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households	1,335,078 7.14
70 Kurai Total Households Persons Per Household	808,162 2.59	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes	26.09 38.65 18.14	<ul> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	39.28 39.07 14.52
Median Household Income Areawide	\$30,797	% 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More	10.09 4.08	General Indicators	
Age Characteristics	\$30,797	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	30.55 37.33 8.48	Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	<b>231</b> 88
Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	32.00 23.51 12.08	% All Other Departures % Worked at Home	20.70 2.94	Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	108
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County	9,204 100.00	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	<b>OVs</b> ) pool) 890,988 89.41	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	108 108 108
Workers Living in Area % of Population	996,495 47.00	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	814,074 81.69 76,914 7.72 1.09	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.23 1.65 1.34 0.75
% Male % Female	55.20 44.80	Journey to Work by Mode		Central County Maricopa,AZ	
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Out of Area	996,495 98.11 1.89	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi	75.05 14.37 2.00 0.01 0.11	Suburban Counties None	
Journey-to-Work Flows		Other % Motorcycle	0.73		
% Central-Central County % Work Out of Area	98.11 1.89	% Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	2.65 1.40 0.74 2.94		

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Phoenix, AZ MSA (1990)



P-46

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	2,067,959 40.33 59.67 89.17 10.83	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.78 22.18 21.46	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	1,324,840 9.12 44.38 34.95 11.54
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County	870,999 2.32 \$26,036 \$28,477	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More	29.03 39.16 16.61 8.94 3.99	General Indicators Population/Sq.Mile Households/Sq. Mile	810 341
Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	\$24,386 38.50 18.21 21.55	Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	23.99 44.45 11.33 17.96 2.27	Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	358 353 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	2,554 41.14 58.86	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> ( <b>P</b> ( (Includes Drive Alone and Car	DVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cour By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 335 311
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	842,308 92.08	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	<b>1.05</b> 1.52 1.45
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	914,711 44.20 53.20 46.80	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	777,386 84.99 64,922 7.10	Workers/Vehicle Central County Hillsborough,FL	0.69
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	410,950 90.95 5.11 3.95	POV Occupancy Journey to Work by Mode	1.08	Suburban Counties Florida: Hemando Pasco	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	503,761 9.91 82.03 5.45 2.62	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	78.82 13.27 1.31	Pinellas	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.02 0.13		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	40.86 2.29 5.46 45.17 3.00 3.22	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.39 2.27 0.73 0.80 2.27		



Denver - Boulder, CO CMSA

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,848,319 25.30 74.70 94.23 5.77	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	22.42 20.80 22.94	Total Household Vehicles1% 0 Vehicle Households1% 1 Vehicle Households2% 2 Vehicle Households3+ Vehicle Households	,307,645 7.76 33.29 38.93 20.03
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	739,001 2.46 \$33,126 \$25,106 \$35,842 32.60 23.03 9.16	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	25.83 40.83 17.32 8.95 3.47 27.76 42.06 9.34 17.23 3.60	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Household/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	410 164 214 217 1,510 2,442
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	4,503 3.40 96.60	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles (PC</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Carp	Ws) ool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Counti By Place of Residence By Place of Work	les 169 138
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	843,448 87.41	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.31 1.71 1.36
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	964,912 52.20 53.70 46.30	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	779,545 80.79 63,903 6.62	Workers/Vehicle Central County	0.74
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	231,503 67.66 31.03	POV Occupancy	1.08	Denver, CO Suburban Counties Colorado:	
<ul> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	1.31 733,409 28.60 SO.67 18.49 2.24	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	74.98 12.44 4.16	Adams Arapahoe Boulder Douglas Jefferson	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.02 0.06		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	16.23 7.45 21.73 38.51 14.05 2.02	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.20 3.28 0.72 0.54 3.60		

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Denver-Boulder, CO CMSA (1990)



Cincinnati - Hamilton, OH - KY - IN CMSA

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties	1,744,124 49.67 50.33	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area	22.11	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households	1,100,494 11.66 31.73
% Croan % Rural	85.09 14.91	Suburban Counties	21.55	% 3+ Vehicle Households	18.15
Total Households Persons Per Household	652,333 2.61	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes	26.49	General Indicators	
Median Household Income Areawide	\$30,979	% 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes	42.19 17.28 8.71	Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	673 252
Central County Suburban Counties	\$29,498 \$32,440	% 60 Minutes or More	3.24	Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence	314
Age Characteristics Median Age	32.20	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM	24.57 42.26	By Place of Work	318
% 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	24.01 11.75	% 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	10.46 20.62 2.10	Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ty 980 1,274
Square Miles Areawide Total	2,592	Duinet la Oran e Velticles (D	<b>DV</b> -)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou	inties
% Suburban Counties	84.28	(Includes Drive Alone and Car	pool)	By Place of Work	189 140
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	736,585 90.63	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.25 1.69 1.35
Living in Area % of Population	812,766 46.60	POV Drivers % POV Drivers	687,070 84.53	Workers/Vehicle	0.74
% Male % Female	53.60 46.40	<ul><li>% POV Passengers</li><li>% POV Passengers</li></ul>	49,515 6.09	<b>Central County</b> Hamilton, OH	
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	399,406 89.23 8 85	POV Occupancy	1.07	Suburban Counties	
% Work Out of Area	1.92	Journey to Work by Mode		Clermont Warren	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County	413,360 34.94 46.09	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carnool	79.20	Indiana:	
<ul><li>% Work Different County</li><li>% Work Out of Area</li></ul>	12.70 6.27	Transit	11.45	Kentucky:	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi	3.55 0.01 0.10	Boone Campbell Kenton	
% Central-Central County	43.85	Other	0.10		
% Central-Suburban County % Suburban Central County	4.35	% Motorcycle	0.07		
% Within Suburban County	23.44	% Bicycle	0.10		
% Work Out of Area	6.40 4.13	% Work at Home	2.10		

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH-KY-IN CMSA (1990)



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,607,183 59.69 40.31 89.57 10.43	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	19.96 19.70 20.30	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	955,540 13.41 33.88 37.66 15.05
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	601,967 2.61 \$32,359 \$27,867 \$39,010 32.70 23.78 12.42	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	32.27 43.14 13.61 6.00 2.74 28.84 38.69 8.28 21.95 2.24	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	896 336 431 436 1y 1,819 1,986
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	1,793 13.47 86.53	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> ( (Includes Drive Alone and Ca	POVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 215 194
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	680,827 88.10	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.28 1.59 1.24
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	772,752 48.10 53.10 46.90	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	636,119 82.32 44,708 5.79	Workers/Vehicle Central County	0.81
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	439,449 86.22 12.29 1.49	POV occupancy Journey to Work by Mode	1.07	Milwaukee,Wl Suburban Counties Wisconsin: Ozaukee	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	333,303 27.82 61.59 5.82 4.77	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	77.17 10.94 4.79	Racıne Washington Waukesha	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.03 0.06		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	49.03 6.99 12.00 26.56 2.51 2.90	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.12 3.95 0.28 0.43 2.24		

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Milwaukee-Racine, WI CMSA (1990)



Kansas City, MO - KS MSA

Demographics and Land Area
Area Population
% Central County
% Suburban Counties
% Urban

% Rural

Areawide Central County

Total Households

Persons Per Household

Suburban Counties

Age Characteristics

% 65 Years or More

% Central County

% Suburban Counties

Living in Central County

% Work Out of Area

% Work Central County

% Work Suburban County

Living in Suburban Counties

% Work Central County

% Work Different County

% Work Same County

% Work Out of Area

Journey-to-Work Flows

% Central-Central County

% Central-Suburban County

% Suburban-Central County

% Within Suburban County

% Work Out of Area

% To Other Suburban County

Median Age % 15 Years or Less

Square Miles Areawide Total

Workers

Living in Area % of Population

% Male

% Female

Median Household Income

#### **Travel Time**

Ш

1,566,280 40.43 59.57 89.21 10.79 602,514	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties Commute Length	21.44 22.02 21.05
2.55	<ul> <li>% Less Than 15 Minutes</li> <li>% 15 - 29 Minutes</li> <li>% 30 - 39 Minutes</li> </ul>	27.87 41.63 17.04
\$31,948 \$27,853 \$34,727	% 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More	7.70 3.00
32.90 23.73 11.61	% 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	25.47 45.25 8.63 17.88 2.17
4,988 12.13	Privately Owned Vehicles (Pe	OVs)
87.87	(includes Drive Alone and Carpo	001)
	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	712,685 92.40
771,309	POV Drivers	660,713
49.20 52.00	% POV Drivers	85.66 51.072
47.10	% POV Passengers	6.74
304,852 79.68	POV Occupancy	1.08
1.40	Journey to Work by Mode	
466,457	Privately Owned Vehicles	70.00
466,457 25.03 54.53	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool	79.88
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit	79.88 12.52
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	79.88 12.52 2.02
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01 0.10
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57 31.49 7.48	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi Other	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01 0.10
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57 31.49 7.48 15 13	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi Other % Motorcycle % Walk	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01 0.10 0.09 1.89
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57 31.49 7.48 15.13 32.98	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01 0.10 0.09 1.89 0.10
466,457 25.03 54.53 17.87 2.57 31.49 7.48 15.13 32.98 10.81	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other	79.88 12.52 2.02 0.01 0.10 0.09 1.89 0.10 0.61

#### I Vehicle Availability

Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	1,039,273 8.62 33.06 40.77 17.56
General Indicators	
Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile	314 121
Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work	155 158
Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	504 612
Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Coun By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ties 106 95
Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.28 1.72 1.35 0.74
<b>Central County</b> Jackson, MO	
Suburban Counties Missouri: Cass Clay Lafayette Platte Ray Kansas: Johnson Leavenworth Miami Wyandotte	



Journey-to-Work	Profile:	Sacramento,	CA	MSA	(1990)	)
-----------------	----------	-------------	----	-----	--------	---

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Tie		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,481,102 70.30 29.70 87.94 12.06	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.80 21.73 21.97	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	993,322 7.64 32.63 39.40 20.33
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	557,811 2.60 \$32,734 \$32,297 \$33,768 32.20 23.67 10.75	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	29.05 40.47 15.40 1.79 4.19 26.99 41.62 10.01 18.26 3.11	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	291 110 135 133 499 520
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	5,094 18.96 81.04	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> (P( (Includes Drive Alone and Carp	DVs) bool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ies 49 43
Workers Living in Area % of Population % Male	685,945 46.30 54.00	<ul> <li>Workers Travel by POVs</li> <li>% Travel by POVs</li> <li>POV Drivers</li> <li>% POV Drivers</li> <li>POV Passengers</li> <li>% POV P</li> </ul>	609,800 88.90 559,310 81.54 50,490	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.23 1.78 1.45 0.69
<ul> <li>% Female</li> <li>Living in Central County</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> </ul>	46.00 482,321 88.07 7.63	% POV Passengers POV Occupancy	1.09	Central County Sacramento, CA Suburban Counties California:	
<ul> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	4.30 203,624 28.60 60.37 9.13 1.90	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % carpool Transit % Bus	75.22 13.68 2.12	El Dorado Placer Yolo	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.24 0.04		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	61.93 5.36 8.49 17.92 2.71 3.59	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.46 2.68 1.81 0.64 3.11		



Portland - Vancouver, OR - WA CMSA

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,477,895 39.51 60.49 84.68 15.32	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	576,083 2.52 \$31,070 \$26,928 \$33,775 33.80 23.12 11.97 4.371	Commute Length % Less Than 1.5 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home
% Central County % Suburban Counties	9.96 90.04	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles(POVs)</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Carpool)
Workers		Workers Travel by POVs 6 % Travel by POVs
, Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female 45.20	724,532 49.00 54.80	POV Drivers57% POV DriversPOV Passengers% POV Passengers
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County	286,600 80.87 17.54	POV occupancy
% Work Out of Area	17.54	Journey to Work by Mode
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	437,932 30.48 57.82 8.25 3.45	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus
Journey-to-Work Plows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	31.99 6.94 18.42 34.95 4.99 2.71	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home

#### Vehicle Availability

21.72 21.11 22.12

28.27 40.91 15.37 7.98 3.70

25.80

41.83 9.49 19.11

3.77

623,518

86.06 575,942 79.49 47,576 6.57

1.08

73.78 12.28

> 5.22 0.14 0.05

> 0.33 3.27 0.61 0.55 3.77

Total Household Vehicles1,009,431% 0 Vehicle Households8.80% 1 Vehicle Households32.26% 2 Vehicle Households39.53% 3+ Vehicle Households19.42	
General Indicators	
Population/Sq. Mile338Households/Sq. Mile132	
Workers/Sq. Mile, AreawideBy Place of Residence166By Place of Work167	
Worker/Sq. Mile, Central CountyBy Place of Residence658By Place of Work863	
 Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Counties By Place of Residence 111 By Place of Work 90	
Workers/Household1.26Vehicles/Household1.75Vehicles/Worker1.39Workers/Vehicle0.72	
Central County Multnomah, OR	
Suburban Counties Oregon: Clackamas Washington Yamhill Washington: Clark	



Norfolk - Virginia Beach - Newport News, VA MSA

#### Journey-to-Work Profile: Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
AreaPopulation % Central City % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,396,107 18.71 81.29 94.77 5.23	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central City Suburban Counties	21.63 20.58 21.83	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% I Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	829,469 9.90 33.58 40.02 16.50
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central City Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	494,145 2.69 \$30,841 \$23,563 \$32,516 29,70 23,89 9.03 1,685	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	26.03 40.92 16.39 8.07 3.25 31.96 35.72 9.73 17.25 5.34	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central City By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou	829 293 474 442 2,429 3,859 unties
% Central City % Suburban Counties	3.19 96.81	Privately <b>Owned Vehicles</b> (P( (Includes Drive Alone and Car	OVs) pool)	By Place of Residence By Place of Work	410 329
Workers Living in Area	698,999	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers	607,168 86.86 553,267	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.41 1.68 1.19 0.84
% of Population % Male % Female	50.10 58.00 42.00	% POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	79.15 53,901 7.71	Central City	
Living in Central City % Work Central City % Work Suburban County	130,549 <b>77. 23</b> 20.12	POV Occupancy	1.10	Suburban Counties Virginia:	
<ul> <li>work Out of Afea</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central City</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Journey-to-Work Flows</li> <li>% Central-Central City</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central City</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> </ul>	2.00 568,450 18.34 52.73 23.91 5.02 14.42 3.76 14.92 42.88 19.44	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail % Taxi Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other	72.74 14.13 2.03 0.03 0.12 0.27 3.67 0.52 1.15	James City York Chesapeake City Hampton City Newport News City Poquoson City Portsmouth City Suffolk City Virginia Beach City Williamsburg City	


Demographics and Land Area		Travel Tie		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,377,419 69.80 30.20 80.92 19.08	Mean (in minutes.) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.24 20.34 23.55	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	899,191 8.88 33.55 40.08 17.49
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	525,558 2.54 \$30,668 \$30,375 \$3 1,345 31.50 22.53 10.00 3,579	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	27.91 43.90 15.60 7.09 3.19 24.40 43.10 10.01 20.19 2.31	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Coun By Place of Residence By Place of Work	385 147 187 196 ty 902 1,031 unties
% Central County % Suburban Counties	15.09 84.91	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car Workers Travial by POVs	OVs) rpool)	By Place of Residence By Place of Work	59 48
Workers		% Travel by POVs	90.92	Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	1.29 1.71 1.33
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female Living in Central County % Work Central County	677,859 49.20 53.40 46.60 487,305 95.24	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	575,641 84.92 40,701 6.00 1.07	Workers/Vehicle Central County Franklin, OH Suburban Counties	0.75
% Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area Living in Suburban Counties	3.0 1.76 190,554	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles		Ohio: Delaware Fairfield Licking	
<ul> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	37.57 53.88 3.21 5.35	% Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Pail	79.51 11.41 2.64	Madison Pickaway Union	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Kall % Taxi	0.01		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	68.47 2.16 10.56 15.15 0.90 2.77	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.09 3.25 0.24 0.45 2.31		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Columbus, OH MSA (1990)

. .



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
<ul> <li>Area Population</li> <li>% Central County</li> <li>% Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Urban</li> <li>% Rural</li> </ul>	1,302,099 91.04 8.96 91.21 8.79	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.88 21.82 22.57	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	736,958 10.02 36.70 37.78 15.50
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	451,731 2.82 \$26,092 \$25,926 \$27,778 30.30 25.90 10.26	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	25.43 44.29 17.82 6.49 3.67 26.44 43.69 91.10 18.47 2.30	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	517 179 226 230 414 433
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	2,520 49.49 50.51	Privately Owned Vehicles (PO (Includes Drive Alone and Carp	DVs)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Countie By Place of Residence By Place of Work	es 41 31
<b>Workers</b> Living in Area	569,149	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers	508,377 89.32 462,800	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.26 1.63 1.29 0.77
<ul><li>% of Population</li><li>% Male</li><li>% Female</li></ul>	43.70 54.90 45.10	% POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	81.31 45,577 8.01	<b>Central County</b> Bexar, TX	
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	516,606 97.25 0.58 2.17	POV occupancy Journey to Work by Mode	1.10	Suburban Counties Texas: Comal	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	52,543 28.12 55.07 7.75 9.05	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	74.56 14.76 3.61	Guadalupe	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.01 0.05		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	88.27 0.53 2.60 5.08 0.72 2.81	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.23 3.58 0.16 0.75 2.30		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: San Antonio, TX MSA (1990)

Indianapolis, IN MSA



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
AreaPopulation % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1249,822 63.78 36.22 82.71 17.29	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.92 20.79 23.92	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	821,816 8.85 33.81 39.87 <b>17.47</b>
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	480,406 2.56 \$31,655 \$29,152 \$36,063 32.30 23.56 11.11	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM- 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 959 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	26.80 42.79 17.11 7.44 3.46 26.51 43.84 8.53 18.72 2.40	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	407 156 203 210 y 1,000 1,251
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	3,071 12.91 87.09	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles (I</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Ca	POVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou By Place of Residence By Place of Work	nties 85 56
Workers Living in Area % of Population	624,97 1 50.00	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	578,705 92.60 535,929 85.75	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.30 1.71 1.31 0.76
% Male % Female Living in Central County % Work Central County	53.10 46.90 396,584 91.69	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	42,776 6.84 1.08	Central County Marion, IN Suburban Counties	
<ul> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	6.28 2.03 228,387 46.95 43.68 4.28 5.12	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	79.74 12.86 1.95	Indiana: Boone Hamilton Hancock Hendricks Johnson Morgan Shelby	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.01 0.11		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	58.18 3.98 17.16 15.95 1.56 3.16	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.07 2.17 0.14 0.53 2.40		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Indianapolis, IN MSA (1990)



Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,238,816 40.11 59.89 93.16 6.84	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	24.36 23.67 24.76	Total Household Vehicles638,8% 0 Vehicle Households18% 1 Vehicle Households37% 2 Vehicle Households33% 3+ Vehicle Households10	339 3.19 3.30 .71 0.79
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	454,417 2.67 \$24,442 \$18,477 \$28,438 <b>31.80</b> 24.99 11.05	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 959 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	24.05 39.15 18.73 9.80 6.54 27.86 41.75 10.97 17.70 1.72	General Indicators         Population/Sq. Mile         Households/Sq. Mile         Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide         By Place of Residence         By Place of Work         Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County         By Place of Residence         By Place of Work         Households         By Place of Work         By Place of Work         By Place of Work         By Place of Work         By Place of Work	537 197 223 222 035 <b>380</b>
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	2,309 7.82 92.18	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles</b> (I (Includes Drive Alone and Ca	POVs) rpool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Counties By Place of Residence By Place of Work	154 124
Workers Living in Area	5 14,726	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers	443,696 86.20 400,395	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.13 1.41 1.24 ).81
% of Population % Male % Female	41.50 53.60 46.40	% POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	43,301 8.41	<b>Central County</b> Orleans Parish, LA	
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	186,926 81.18 16.33 2.50	POV occupancy Journey to Work by Mode	1.11	Suburban Counties Louisiana: Jefferson Parish	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	327,800 28.25 57.77 8.67 5.31	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	70.97 15.31 6.86	St. Charles Parish St. John the Baptist Parish St. Tammany Parish	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.01 0.29		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	29.48 5.93 17.99 36.79 5.52 4.29	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.17 3.10 0.50 1.06 1.72		

# Journey-to-Work Profile: New Orleans, LA MSA (1990)

Ŧ



Buffalo - Niagara Falls, NY CMSA

#### Travel Time Vehicle Availability **Demographics and Land Area** 1.189.288 Area Population Mean (in minutes) Total Household Vehicles 676,505 % Central County Originating in: 81.44 % 0 Vehicle Households 16.30 % Suburban County 18.56 Area 19.43 % | Vehicle Households 37.19 % Urban 85.44 Central County 33.99 19.71 % 2 Vehicle Households % Rural 14.56 Suburban County 18.21 % 3+ Vehicle Households 12.52 Total Households 460,707 Commute Length Persons Per Household 2.51 % Less Than 15 Minutes 33.47 **General Indicators** % 15 - 29 Minutes 42.57 Median Household Income % 30 - 39 Minutes 14.28 Population/Sq. Mile 758 \$28,084 % 40 - 59 Minutes 5.51 Households/Sq. Mile Areawide 294 Central County \$28,005 % 60 Minutes or More 2.33 Suburban County \$28,431 Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide Tie Workers Leave Home By Place of Residence 339 By Place of Work Age Characteristics % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM 20.89 340 % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM Median Age 34.70 42.29 % 15 Years or Less % 8:30 AM · 9:59 AM 21.13 12.88 Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County % 65 Years or More % All Other Departures 22.09 By Place of Residence 414 15.18 % Worked at Home 1.85 By Place of Work 428 Square Miles Areawide Total 1,568 Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Counties % Central County 66.64 Privately Owned Vehicles (POVs) By Place of Residence 188 % Suburban County 33.36 (Includes Drive Alone and Carpool) By Place of Work 165 Workers Travel by POVs 468,941 Workers/Household 1.15 Workers % Travel by POVs 88.29 Vehicles/Household 1.47 Vehicles/Worker 1.27 Living in Area POV Drivers 437,442 Workers/Vehicle 531,122 0.79 % of Population % POV Drivers 44.70 82.36 % Male 53.10 POV Passengers 31,499 % Female 46.90 % POV Passengers 5.93 Central County Erie, NY Living in Central County 432,883 1.07 POV Occupancy % Work Central County 94.58 Suburban County % Work Suburban County 3.00 New York: % Work Out of Area 2.42 Journey to Work by Mode Niagara 98,239 Living in Suburban County Privately Owned Vehicles % Work Central County 24.71 % Drive Alone 77.09 % Work Same County % Carpool 72.63 11.20 % Work Out of Area 2.66 Transit % Bus 4.06 % Subway/Rail 0.39 Journey-to-Work Flows % Taxi 0.25 11.09 % Central-Central County Other % Central-Suburban County 2.44 % Motorcycle 0.05 % Suburban-Central County 4.57 % Walk 4.38 % Within Suburban County % Bicycle 0.21 13.43 % Work Out of Area 2.46 % Other 0.52 % Work at Home 1.85

### Journey-to-Work Profile: Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY CMSA (1990)



. .

֔€

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
<ul><li>Area Population</li><li>% Central County</li><li>% Suburban Counties</li><li>% Urban</li><li>% Rural</li></ul>	1,162,093 44.01 55.99 68.71 31.29	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	21.61 22.06 21.24	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	793,989 8.65 30.39 39.51 21.44
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	440,458 2.58 \$31,126 \$33,830 \$29,001 32.70 22.02 10.92 3,379	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	27.90 40.96 17.21 8.80 3.25 26.83 43.92 8.73 18.63 1.88	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cou	344 130 <b>179</b> 186 y 526 674 nties
% Central County % Suburban Counties	15.61 84.39	Privately Owned Vehicles (PC (Includes Drive Alone and Carr Workers Travel by POVs	DVs) bool) 564.043	By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Household	115 96
Workers Living in Area % of Population	604,856 52.00	% Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	93.25 516,599 85.41	Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.80 1.31 0.76
% Male % Female	53.50 46.50	POV Passengers % POV Passengers	47,444 7.84	<b>Central County</b> Mecklenburg, NC	
<ul> <li>Work Central County</li> <li>Work Suburban County</li> <li>Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>Work Central County</li> </ul>	93.40 4.13 2.46 327,629 22.10	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone	78.76	Suburban Counties North Carolina: Cabarrus Gaston Lincoln Rowan	
% Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	65.23 6.65 6.03	% Carpool Transit % Bus % Subway/Rail	14.49 1.69 0.01	Union South Carolina: York	
Journey-to-Work Flows % Central-Central County	42.81	% Taxi Other	0.14		
<ul> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	1.89 11.97 35.33 3.60 4.39	% Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.10 2.07 0.13 0.72 1.88		



Providence - Pawtucket - Fall River, RI - MA CMSA (NECMA)

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Providence-Pawtucket-Fall River, RI-MA CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,141,525 14.08 85.92 87.09 12.91	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	19.65 16.97 20.03	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	559,226 10.99 34.83 37.36 16.82
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total	428,869 2.57 \$31,857 \$22,147 \$33,448 34.00 20.37 15.07	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	36.24 39.87 11.90 6.42 3.82 25.07 43.51 10.94 18.73 1.75	General Indicators Population/Sq.Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work Worker/Sq. Mile, Suburban Court	1,056 397 404 381 7 14,972 15,452
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	1,081 1.71 98.29	<b>Privately Owned Vehicles (PC</b> (Includes Drive Alone and Carp	)Vs) pool)	Worker/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cour By Place of Residence By Place of Work	150 119
Workers Living in Area % of Population	544,668 47.70	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	495,377 90.95 458,997 84.27	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.27 1.30 1.03 0.97
<ul> <li>% Male</li> <li>% Female</li> <li>Living in Central County</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> </ul>	52.60 47.40 276,405 77.50	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	36,380 6.68 1.06	Central City, Central County Providence City, Providence Cou Suburban Counties	nty, RI
<ul> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	8.92 13.58 159,666 28.42 50.91 7.52 13.16	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	78.62 12.33 1.90	CMSA <b>Rhode</b> Island: Bristol Kent (pt.) Newport (pt.) Washington (pt.) Massachusetts: Bristol(pt.)	
Journey-to-Work Flows (calculated using NECMA definiti % Central-Central County % Central-Suburban County % Suburban-Central County % Within Suburban County % To Other Suburban County % Work Out of Area	on) 49.12 5.66 10.40 18.68 2.75 13.43	<ul> <li>% Subway/Rail</li> <li>% Taxi</li> <li>Other</li> <li>% Walk</li> <li>% Bicycle</li> <li>% Other</li> <li>% Work at Home</li> </ul>	0.28 0.04 0.05 3.37 0.16 0.48 1.75	Norfolk(pt.) Worcester (pt.) NECMA Rhode Island: Bristol Kent Washington	



Hartford - New Britain - Middletown, CT MSA (NECMA)

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Hartford-New Britain-Middletown, CT CMSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,085,895 12.87 87.13 80.26 19.74	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	20.60 19.27 20.75	Total Household Vehicles % 0 Vehicle Households % 1 Vehicle Households % 2 Vehicle Households % 3+ Vehicle Households	707,480 10.48 31.13 39.94 18.46
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	411,507 2.56 \$41,440 \$22,140 \$44,290 34.30 20.34 13.32	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or Mom Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 659 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	30.55 40.87 15.86 8.26 2.51 26.23 45.20 10.41 16.22 1.95	General Indicators Population/Sq.Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	759 288 406 439 25,013 29,060
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	1,430 1.21 98.79	Privately Owned Vehicles (P (Includes Drive Alone and Car	OVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Cour By Place of Residence By Place of Work	104 89
Workers Living in Area % of Population	561,969 51.80	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	509,307 90.63 474,640 84.46	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.37 1.72 1.26 0.79
<ul> <li>% Male</li> <li>% Female</li> <li>Living in Central County</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> </ul>	52.70 47.30 432,836 90.45	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	34,667 6.17 1.07	Central City, Central County Hartford City, Hartford County, C Suburban Counties	Γ
<ul> <li>% Work Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> <li>Living in Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> <li>% Work Same County</li> <li>% Work Different County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	3.30 6.25 147,393 36.72 48.08 0.72 14.48	Journey to Work by Mode Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	79.38 11.29 3.56	CMSA Connecticut: Litchfield(pt.) Middlesex (pt.) New London (pt.) Tolland (pt.) NECMA Connecticut:	
Journey-to-Work Flows (calculated using NECMA definition % Central-Central County % Central-Suburban County % Suburban-Central County % Within Suburban County % To Other Suburban County % Work Out of Area	on) 67.47 2.46 9.33 12.21 0.18 8.34	<ul> <li>% Subway/Rail</li> <li>% Taxi</li> <li>Other</li> <li>% Motorcycle</li> <li>% Walk</li> <li>% Bicycle</li> <li>% Other</li> <li>% Work at Home</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 0.05 \\ 0.05 \\ \end{array}$	Middlesex Tolland	



Orlando, FL MSA

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Orlando, FL MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,072,748 63.15 36.85 90.35 9.65	Mean (in minutes) Driginating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	22.88 22.37 23.79	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	688,507 6.64 35.86 41.70 15.81
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less	402,519 2.60 <b>\$31,230</b> \$30,252 \$32,906 32.10 21,77	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 659 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM	24.41 39.84 19.96 10.36 3.48 25.74 43.53 10.25	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central Count	423 159 220 231
% 15 Years of Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County	2,538 35.76	<ul> <li>% 8.30 Aiv - 7.35 Aiv</li> <li>% All Other Departures</li> <li>% Worked at Home</li> </ul> Privately Owned Vehicles (PO)	10.25 18.53 1.95	By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Co By Place of Residence	y 393 483 unties 123
% Suburban Counties Workers	64.24	(Includes Drive Alone and Carr Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs	509,215 91.35	By Place of Work Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker	90 1.38 1.71 1.24
Living in Area % of Population % Male % Female	557,448 52.00 54.80 45.20	POV Drivers % POV Drivers POV Passengers % POV Passengers	469,606 84.24 39,606 7.10	Workers/Vehicle Central County Orange El	0.81
Living in Central County % Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	356,271 89.12 7.81 3.08	POV Occupancy Journey to Work by Mode	1.08	Suburban Counties Florida: Osceola	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	201,177 44.79 50.10 0.95 4.16	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % carpool Transit % Bus	78.08 13.28 1.42	Seminole	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.02 0.10		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	56.95 4.99 16.16 18.08 0.34 3.47	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.43 3.46 0.62 0.65 1.95		



# Journey-to-Work Profile: Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA (1990)

6.07 29.46 42.08 22.39

663 215

296 297

446 471

171 152 1.38 1.88 1.36 0.74

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
<ul> <li>Area Population</li> <li>% Central County</li> <li>% Suburban Counties</li> <li>% Urban</li> <li>% Rural</li> </ul>	1,072,227 67.71 32.29 98.40 1.60	Mean (in minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	19.81 20.15 19.08	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	651,669 6.07 29.46 42.08 22.39
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More Square Miles	347,121 3.04 \$30,882 \$30,149 \$32,419 27.50 32.29 8.44	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	31.27 44.91 12.75 4.94 3.03 24.85 41.17 10.28 20.60 3.10	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	663 215 296 297 446 471
Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	1,617 45.59 54.41	Privately Owned Vehicles (P( (Includes Drive Alone and Car	OVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	ies 171 152
Workers Living in Area % of Population	479,338 44.70	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	432,770 90.28 396,396 82.70	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.38 1.88 1.36 0.74
<ul> <li>% Male</li> <li>% Female</li> <li>Living in Central County</li> <li>% Work Central County</li> </ul>	55.40 44.60 329,238 93.10	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV occupancy	36,374 7.59 1.09	Central County Salt Lake, UT Suburban Counties	
% Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	3.59 3.31	Journey to Work by Mode		Utah: Davis Weber	
Living in Suburban Counties % Work Central County % Work Same County % Work Different County % Work Out of Area	150,100 18.50 62.54 15.71 3.26	Privately Owned Vehicles % Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	76.30 13.99 2.94		
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	$0.01 \\ 0.02$		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	63.95 2.47 5.79 19.58 4.92 3.29	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.30 2.32 0.51 0.51 3.10		



-ر ټ رسې

ŀ

# Journey-to-Work Profile: Rochester, NY MSA (1990)

Demographics and Land Area		Travel Time		Vehicle Availability	
Area Population % Central County % Suburban Counties % Urban % Rural	1,002,410 71.23 28.77 70.58 29.42	Mean (ii minutes) Originating in: Area Central County Suburban Counties	19.73 18.67 22.48	<ul> <li>Total Household Vehicles</li> <li>% 0 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 1 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 2 Vehicle Households</li> <li>% 3+ Vehicle Households</li> </ul>	615,534 11.17 33.94 38.99 15.89
Total Households Persons Per Household Median Household Income Areawide Central County Suburban Counties Age Characteristics Median Age % 15 Years or Less % 65 Years or More	374,856 2.58 \$34,234 \$35,337 \$31,504 32.90 22.52 12.39	Commute Length % Less Than 15 Minutes % 15 - 29 Minutes % 30 - 39 Minutes % 40 - 59 Minutes % 60 Minutes or More Time Workers Leave Home % 5:00 AM - 6:59 AM % 7:00 AM - 8:29 AM % 8:30 AM - 9:59 AM % All Other Departures % Worked at Home	32.74 42.74 12.94 6.44 2.70 25.43 42.25 10.98 18.91 2.43	General Indicators Population/Sq. Mile Households/Sq. Mile Workers/Sq. Mile, Areawide By Place of Residence By Place of Work Workers/Sq. Mile, Central County By Place of Residence By Place of Work	342 128 164 168 526 592
Square Miles Areawide Total % Central County % Suburban Counties	2,932 22.49 77.51	Privately Owned Vehicles (PC (Includes Drive Alone and Car	DVs) pool)	Workers/Sq. Mile, Suburban Count By Place of Residence By Place of Work	592 ties 59 45
Workers Living in Area % of Population	481,467	Workers Travel by POVs % Travel by POVs POV Drivers % POV Drivers	430,132 89.34 400,707 83.23	Workers/Household Vehicles/Household Vehicles/Worker Workers/Vehicle	1.28 1.64 1.28 0.78
% Male % Female Living in Central County	46.00 53.20 46.80 347,088	POV Passengers % POV Passengers POV Occupancy	29,425 6.11 1.07	Central County Monroe, NY	
% Work Central County % Work Suburban County % Work Out of Area	96.67 2.08 1.25	Journey to Work by Mode		Suburban Counties New York: Livingston Ontario	
<ul> <li>Work Central County</li> <li>Work Same County</li> <li>Work Different County</li> <li>Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	32.03 56.23 4.53 7.20	% Drive Alone % Carpool Transit % Bus	77.73 11.61 3.11	Wayne	
Journey-to-Work Flows		% Subway/Rail % Taxi	0.01 0.07		
<ul> <li>% Central-Central County</li> <li>% Central-Suburban County</li> <li>% Suburban-Central County</li> <li>% Within Suburban County</li> <li>% To Other Suburban County</li> <li>% Work Out of Area</li> </ul>	69.69 1.50 8.94 15.70 1.27 2.91	Other % Motorcycle % Walk % Bicycle % Other % Work at Home	0.05 4.34 0.22 0.43 2.43		

### **Appendix A**

## CHANGES IN MSA/CMSACOUNTY LIST, 1974-1983

#### 1. New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT<sup>1</sup>

Bridgeport-Milford, CT PMSA Fairfield County (pt.) New Haven County (pt.) Danbury, CT PMSA Fairfield County (pt.) Litchfield County (pt.) Norwalk, CT PMSA Fairfield County (pt.) Stamford, CT PMSA Fairfield County (pt.) Hunterdon County, NJ Morris County, NJ Ocean County, NJ Sussex County, NJ Orange County, NY

- 2. Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside, CA No Change
- 3. Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN-WI Grundy County, IL Kendall County, IL
- 4. San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA Santa Cruz County
- 5. Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD Cumberland County, NJ
- 6. Detroit-Ann Arbor, MI Monroe County
- 7. Boston-Lawrence-Salem, MA-NH<sup>2</sup> Nashua, NH PMSA Hillsborough County (pt.) Rockingham County (pt.) Salem-Gloucester, MA PMSA

<sup>1</sup>In this report, we do not use any data from the New England portion of the New York City CMSA. References above are provided for information only.

<sup>2</sup> New England CMSA must be reviewed in detail at the partial county level in order to insure accuracy.

Essex County (pt.)

#### 8. Washington, DC-MD-VA Calvert County, MD Frederick County, MD Stafford County, VA

9. Dallas-Fort Worth, TX

**Removed Counties** 

Hood County Wise County

- 10. Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX No Change
- 11. Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL No Change
- 12. Atlanta, GA Barrow County Cowetta County Spaulding County
- 13. Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, OH No Change
- 14. Seattle-Tacoma, WA No Change
- 15. San Diego, CA No Change
- 16. Minneapolis-St Paul, MN-WI Isanti County, MN
- 17. St. Louis, MO-IL Jersey County, IL
- 18. Baltimore, MD Queen Anne's County
- **19. Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA** Fayette County
- 20. Phoenix, AZ
- 21. Tampa, FL Hernando County

Leaven	worth,	KS
Miami	County	y, KS

Lafayette County, MO

26. Sacramento, CA El Dorado County

**Denver-Boulder**, CO

Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN

Milwaukee-Racine, WI

Kansas City, MO-KS

No Change

22.

23.

24.

25.

27. Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA Yamhill County, OR Clark County, WA

#### 28. Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA<sup>3</sup>

- Gloucester County James City County York County Chesapeake city Hampton city Newport News city Norfolk city Poquoson city Portsmouth city Suffolk city Virginia Beach city Williamsburg city
- 29. Columbus, OH Licking County Union County
- 30. San Antonio, TX No Change
- 31. Indianapolis, IN

Madison County

**Removed Counties** Gilpin County

Butler County, OH

<sup>3</sup> Indicated that this MSA or CMSA was added to the ranks of metropolitan areas over one million population.

#### **Removed Counties**

- 32. New Orleans, LA St. Charles Parish St. John the Baptist Parish
- 33. Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY No Change

### 34. Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC<sup>4</sup>

Cabarrus County, NC Gaston County, NC Lincoln County, NC Mecklenburg County, NC Rowan County, NC Union County, NC York County, SC

#### 35. Providence-Pawtucket-Fall River, RI-MA<sup>5</sup>

Pawtucket-Woonsocket-Attleborro, RI-MA PMSA Providence County, RI (pt.) Bristol County, MA (pt.) Norfolk County, MA (pt.) Worcester County, MA (pt.)

#### **36.** Hartford-New Britain-Middletown, CT<sup>6</sup>

Bristol PMSA Hartford County (pt.) Litchfield County (pt.) Hartford PMSA Hartford County (pt.) Litchfield County (pt.) Middlesex County (pt.) New London County (pt.) Tolland County (pt.) Middletown PMSA Middlesex County (pt.) New Britain PMSA Hartford County (pt.)

<sup>4</sup> Indicated that this MSA or CMSA was added to the ranks of metropolitan areas over one million population.

<sup>5</sup> New England CMSA must be reviewed in detail at the partial county level in order to ensure accuracy.

<sup>6</sup> New England CMSA must be reviewed in detail at the partial county level in order to ensure accuracy.

#### **Removed Counties**

**37. Orlando, FL**<sup>7</sup>

Orange County Osceola County Seminole County

- 38. Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT<sup>8</sup> Davis County Salt Lake County Weber County
- **39. Rochester, NY<sup>9</sup>** Livingston County Monroe County Ontario County Orleans County Wayne County

#### 44. Dayton-Springfield, OH<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> This MSA or CMSA was added to the ranks of metropolitan areas with over one million in population.

<sup>8</sup> This MSA or CMSA was added to the ranks of metropolitan areas with over one million in population.

<sup>9</sup> This MSA or CMSA was added to the ranks of metropolitan areas with over one million in population.

<sup>10</sup> MSA no longer has a population over one million.

# **Appendix B**

### LIST OF ALL COUNTIES IN METROPOLITAN AREAS -**1983 GEOGRAPHY** (Note: \* = central county)

3.

4.

**New York-Northern** 1. New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT New Jersey Bergen Essex Hudson Hunterdon Middlesex Monmouth Morris Ocean Passaic Somerset Sussex Union New York Bronx Kings Nassau \* New York Orange Putnam Queens Richmond Rockland Suffolk Westchester Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside, CA 2.

# California

Orange \* Los Angeles Ventura Riverside San Bernardino Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN-W Illinois Cook DuPage Grundy Kane Kendall Lake McHenry Will Indiana Lake Porter Wisconsin Kenosha San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA California

Alameda Contra Costa Mar-in Napa \* San Francisco San Mateo Santa Clara Santa Cruz Solano County Sonoma County

### 5. Philadelphia-Wiiington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD

New Jersev Burlington Camden Cumberland Gloucester Salem Mercer Pennsylvania Bucks Chester Delaware Montgomery \* Philadelphia Delaware New Castle Maryland

Cecil

6. Detroit-Ann Arbor, MI

Michigan Lapeer Livingston Macomb Monroe Oakland St. Clair Washtenaw \* Wayne

### 7. Boston-Lawrence-Salem, MA-NH Massachusetts

\* Miscellaneous Towns/Cities \* Boston City New Hampshire Miscellaneous Towns/Cities 8.

#### Washington, DC-MD-VA

District of Columbia Maryland Calvert Charles Frederick Montgomery Prince Georges Virginia Arlington Fairfax Loudoun Prince William Stafford Alexandria City Fairfax City Falls Church City Manassas City Manassas Park City

#### 9. Dallas-Fort Worth, TX

Texas Collin \* Dallas Denton Ellis Johnson Kaufman Parker Rockwall Tarrant

#### 10. Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX

Texas Brazoria Fort Bend Galveston \* Harris Liberty Montgomery Waller

# 11. Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL

Florida

\*

Broward Dade

#### 12. Atlanta, GA

\*

Barrow Butts Cherokee Clayton Cobb Cowetta Dekalb Douglas Fayette Forsyth Fulton Gwinnett Henry Newton Paulding Rockdale Spaulding Walton

#### Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, OH 13. Ohio Portage summit \* Cuyahoga

Geauga Lake Lorain Medina

#### Seattle-Tacoma, WA 14. Washington King Pierce Snohomish

#### San Diego, CA 15. California San Diego

#### Minneapolis-St Paul, MN-WI 16.

Minnesota Anoka Carver Chisago Dakota \* Hennepin Isanti Ramsey Scott Washington Wright Wisconsin St. Croix

#### St. Louis, MO-IL 17.

Illinois Clinton Jersey Madison Monroe St. Clair Missouri Franklin Jefferson St. Charles St. Louis \* St. Louis City

#### Baltimore, MD 18.

\*

Maryland Anne Arundel Baltimore Carroll Harford Howard Queen Anne's \* Baltimore City

#### 19. Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA

Pennsylvania Allegheny Beaver Fayette Washington Westmoreland

20.	<b>Phoenix, AZ</b> Arizonia * Maricopa
21.	Tampa, FL Florida * Hemando * Hillsborough Pasco Pinellas
22.	Denver-Boulder, CO Colorado Adams Arapahoe Boulder * Denver Douglas Jefferson
23.	Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN Indiana Dearbon Kentucky Boone Campbell Kenton Ohio Clermont * Hamilton Warren
24.	Milwaukee-Racine, WI Wisconsin * Milwaukee Ozaukee Racine Washington Waukesha

#### Kansas City, MO-KS 25.

Kansas Johnson Leavenworth Miami Wyandotte Missouri Cass Clay \* Jackson Lafayette Platte Ray Sacramento, CA

### 26.

California El Dorado Placer \* Sacramento Yolo

#### Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA 27.

Oregon Clackamas \* Multnomah Washington Yamhill Washington Clark

#### Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport 28. News, VA

Virginia Gloucester James City York Chesapeake City Hampton City Newport News City Norfolk City Poquoson Čity Portsmouth City Suffolk City Virginia Beach Williamsburg City

\*

#### 29. Columbus, OH

Ohio

Delaware

Fairfield Franklin Licking Madison Pickaway Union

#### **30.** San Antonio, TX Texas \* Bexar Compl

Coma1 Guadalupe

# **31.** Indianapolis, IN Indiana

1

Boone Hamilton Hancock Hendricks Johnson Marion Morgan Shelby

### 32. New Orleans, LA

Louisiana

\*

\*

Jefferson Parish Orleans Parish St. Bernard Parish St. Charles Parish St. John the Baptist Parish St. Tammany Parish

# 33. Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY

New York

- Erie
  - Niagara

### 34. Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-

### SC

35.

North Carolina Cabarrus Gaston Lincoln \* Meclclenburg Rowan Union South Carolina York Providence-Pawtucket-Fall River, RI-MA Massachusetts Miscellaneous Towns/Cities Rhode Island Miscellaneous Towns/Cities \* Providence City

# **36.** Hartford-New Britain-Middletown, CT

# Connecticut

\* Miscellaneous Towns/Cities Hartford City

### 37. Orlando, FL

Florida \* Orange Osceola Seminole

### 38. Salt Lake City, UT

Utah \* Davis \* Salt Lake Weber

### 39. Rochester, NY

New York Livingston \* Monroe Ontario Orleans Wayne

#### GPO : 1994 0 - 153-916 QL 3