



National
Association of
Regional
Councils

1700 K Street NW • Suite 1300 • Washington DC 20006
(202) 457-0710 • FAX: (202) 296-9352

RECEIVED
AUG 21 1989
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Metropolitan Planning Organizations

FROM: Alice J. Watland, Data Services Manager

SUBJECT: Centralized Purchase of the 1990 Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP)

DATE: August 16, 1989

The National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) has recently introduced a new program which addresses the needs of its member's data and information centers. As part of this new initiative, NARC is involved in an effort to facilitate a centralized purchase of the Census Transportation Planning Package for all MPOs and states across the country.

NARC has been working closely with the Journey-to-Work design committee over the past four months to develop a preliminary proposal which would provide packages of data for use in both statewide and urban transportation planning activities. The benefits of such a program include an earlier delivery date as well as a lower unit cost (an estimated 15% savings) for the recipients of the data. The total cost of the package would be \$2.5 million, or roughly a penny per capita.

The program would produce data for large-area and small-area geography. Statewide data would provide journey-to-work characteristics for political jurisdictions such as counties, cities, towns and townships, etc. Urban packages, similar to the 1980 UTPP, would provide data at the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) or census tract level for metropolitan study areas. The statewide tabulations would be released as early as first quarter 1992. Urban tabulation production would begin in late 1992 and extend into early 1993.

Because the prospect of obtaining a national level CTPP is so important for statewide and non-urban planning, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the Federal Highway Administration have agreed to explore a process for providing the CTPP through AASHTO and a lead state. The Maryland Department of Transportation has agreed to act in that capacity.

Enclosed is the proposed process as outlined by FHWA as well as a copy of the memo and questionnaire sent by AASHTO to its Standing Committee

President
GUS F. MUTSCHER
Brenham, Texas

First Vice President
JOHN A. F. MELTON
Los Angeles, California

Second Vice President
BRIAN CORCORAN
Seattle, Washington

Immediate Past President
T. J. "TED" HACKWORTH
Denver, Colorado

Executive Director
RICHARD C. HARTMAN

on Planning. The results of the AASHTO survey will determine the level of interest within each state in pursuing a joint purchase program.

In order to better represent the interests of the MPOs, we want your feedback on the proposed program as well. PLEASE COMPLETE THE ENCLOSED MPO QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT TO ME NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 8, 1989.

Further, we encourage you to contact your state Department of Transportation officials TODAY and discuss this centralized purchase and the importance of this data for effective transportation and economic development planning. Because each state is currently in the process of responding to the AASHTO questionnaire, it is critical that you act as soon as possible to insure 100% participation among state DOTs and thus realize the cost and time benefits associated with the centralized purchase.

NARC will continue to play an active role representing the interests of the MPOs as this program is developed. We will encourage and facilitate increased MPO participation and review during the package design process to insure that the 1990 CTPP meets your transportation planning needs. We will lobby for a timely and expanded training program so that all MPOs can utilize the information more efficiently and effectively. And, we will monitor the process for providing the CTPP through AASHTO, advocate 100% state DOT participation, and assist MPOs as they work out agreements for purchase of the package through their state DOTs or directly with AASHTO and the Census Bureau, if necessary.

Please feel free to call me directly at NARC with your comments and questions. I look forward to working with you over the coming months to make this centralized purchase a reality.

Metropolitan Planning Organization

•Survey of Interest•

Participation in Centralized Purchase of Census Transportation Planning Package



National Association of Regional Councils

This survey is being conducted by the National Association of Regional Councils with a view to undertaking a joint purchase program of the 1990 CTPP. The advantages of a joint purchase would be a lower price and earlier availability. Please indicate your interest in participating in such a program so that we may determine the potential level of distribution.

1. Do you plan to purchase the 1990 CTPP?
yes no not sure (explain)

Blank lines for response to question 1.

2. have you included the purchase of the 1990 CTPP in your Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)?

1990: yes no
1991: yes no

3. Which of the following fund sources would be desirable for payment of any of the costs?

FHWA HPR funds? yes (%) no
FHWA PL funds? yes (%) no
UMTA Section 8 funds? yes (%) no
Other funds? (specify)

Blank lines for response to question 3.

4. Would you favor passing your PL funds through the state to AASHTO to assist in implementing this nationwide program?

yes no

Comments?

Blank lines for comments.

5. Did you use the 1980 UTPP?

yes no

6. What type of media would you prefer for the 1990 CTPP?

- 9 track computer tape
floppy disk
CD ROM
microfiche
printouts
other (specify)

7. What are your training needs with regard to the 1990 CTPP?

Blank lines for response to question 7.

8. Additional comments?

Blank lines for additional comments.

Name

MPO

Telephone

Date

This is a return self-mailer. When you have completed this form, fold it, seal it with tape, apply postage, and return it to NARC.

NATIONWIDE CENSUS TRANSPORTATION DATA PROGRAM

THE PROCESS

The process that would be used if the Census Transportation Data Program is implemented.

1. Create a worker subfiles of basic census records for each State as it becomes available.
2. Tally a summary base file of all journey-to-work flows within and between the counties, cities, towns and townships, etc. of the State including flows to destinations outside the State. The flow records would include characteristics of workers in each origin-destination flow.
3. Accumulate the State files into a national summary file of journey-to-work flows.
4. To create each State file, it would be necessary to extract the records for: (1) internal State trips, (2) for State residents working out of state, and (3) for other State residents working in the subject State. Thus, the State file would contain all workers residing in the State, all workers working in the State, and their origins and destinations.
5. The geography at the residence end of the work trip could be "place" (that is, city, town, or village) of 2,500 or more population and county subdivision (minor civil division or census county division) outside of places in the balance of each county.
6. The geography at the work end could be "place" of 2,500 or more population as reported by respondent and the balance of the county (town or township in the New England and Middle Atlantic states).
7. The detailed specifications for the tabulations would be developed by the Ad Hoc Committee and reviewed through a consensus building process.
8. For each urban data package, a product comparable to the 1980 UTPP would be prepared for each participating transportation study area based on its specifications for traffic analysis zones or census tracts.
9. The urban packages would be tailored directly from the basic census records and the worker subfile.

NATIONWIDE CENSUS TRANSPORTATION DATA PROGRAM

ADVANTAGES OF A NATIONAL PROGRAM

- 1-- Cost savings will be a minimum of 15%, possibly more.
 - (a) Savings realized by reading the basic census records only once for each State for further processing.
 - (b) Savings realized by having Census Bureau staff produce data rather than administrative documents.
 - (c) Administrative overhead will be saved for both Census and State/MPO staffs.
- 2-- Substantial time savings
 - (a) Processing work will be scheduled in advance to assure efficient use of basic records and computer time.
 - (b) Eliminate multiple administrative procurement steps from the process.
 - (c) Save the processing of over 200 contracts and a greater number of cost estimates.
 - (d) Schedule informational sessions in the field in an organized manner.
 - (e) Eliminate the program description discussion with each MPO.
- 3-- Training possibilities enhanced
 - (a) Organize training programs in a logical manner.
 - (b) Better trained users will allow data to be used more effectively.
- 4-- National commuting file will provide previously unavailable Statewide data.
 - (a) Enhance nonurbanized area planning efforts.
 - (b) Provide consistent Statewide data sets.
 - (c) Allow the sharing of technical experiences.
 - (d) Develop a new "Commuting in America" substantially sooner.
- 5-- Coordination with the TIGER system.
 - (a) Integrate work travel with demographic statistics using TIGER.
 - (b) Provide displays of travel flows on maps.
 - (c) TIGER products will include transportation geography allowing comprehensive analysis.

7/13/89

PROCESS FOR PROVIDING CENSUS TRANSPORTATION DATA PACKAGE THROUGH AASHTO

Subsequent to the AASHTO Standing Committee on Planning endorsement, the following would occur:

- . A lead state is selected to oversee the contract as soon as possible.
- . FHWA headquarters sends memorandum to field offices. Memo describes the project, names the Bureau of the Census as the contractor, declares the project's eligibility for HPR and PL funds, includes a sample line item statement for the HPR/PL Work Program, names the lead state, and indicates that the division office in the lead state will handle FHWA's role on behalf of all FHWA field offices.
- * AASHTO sends letter to chief administrative officers of AASHTO's member states discussing project and asking for a commitment of funds.
- . Lead state and AASHTO should have agreement, which sets out what each group will be doing.
- * AASHTO and the lead state should each appoint a liaison to work with the Census Transportation Data Package ad hoc group.
- * FHWA headquarters office develops the Scope of Work for the contract with the Census Bureau.
- . AASHTO, lead state DOT, lead state FHWA division office meet to discuss details and contracts. Lead state will be following its own contracting procedures.
- * AASHTO, lead state DOT, member of ad hoc group, as appropriate, meet with Census to develop contract. Either AASHTO or lead state DOT may contract with Census.
- . States send commitment letters to AASHTO.
- . When a state decides to use FHWA funds, state requests addition of line item to the HPR/PL Work Program. If PL funds are used, it should also appear in the appropriate UPWP. Standard FHWA program and funding approval procedures would apply.
- . If line item approved, HPR or PL funds authorized.
- . States send checks to AASHTO.
- . Lead state sends copy of the executed contract to the lead division.
- . The lead division monitors project progress and cost on behalf of all FHWA field offices.
- * The asterisked items may occur concurrently with other actions.

1990 CENSUS TRANSPORTATION
DATA PROGRAM

Estimated Cost Per State

Name of State	1988 Population	Cost per State
Alabama	4,102	\$41,720
Alaska	524	5,329
Arizona	3,489	35,485
Arkansas	2,395	24,359
California	28,314	287,970
Colorado	3,301	33,573
Connecticut	3,233	32,881
Delaware	660	6,713
District of Col	617	6,275
Florida	12,335	125,454
Georgia	6,342	64,502
Hawaii	1,098	11,167
Idaho	1,003	10,201
Illinois	11,614	118,121
Indiana	5,556	56,508
Iowa	2,834	28,823
Kansas	2,495	25,376
Kentucky	3,727	37,906
Louisiana	4,408	44,832
Maine	1,205	12,256
Maryland	4,622	47,008
Massachusetts	5,889	59,895
Michigan	9,240	93,976
Minnesota	4,307	43,805
Mississippi	2,620	26,647
Missouri	5,141	52,287
Montana	805	8,187
Nebraska	1,602	16,293
Nevada	1,054	10,720
New Hampshire	1,085	11,035
New Jersey	7,721	78,527
New Mexico	1,507	15,327
New York	17,909	182,145
North Carolina	6,489	65,997
North Dakota	667	6,784
Ohio	10,855	110,402
Oklahoma	3,242	32,973
Oregon	2,767	28,142
Pennsylvania	12,001	122,057
Rhode Island	993	10,099
South Carolina	3,470	35,292
South Dakota	713	7,252
Tennessee	4,895	49,785
Texas	16,841	171,283
Utah	1,690	17,188
Vermont	557	5,665
Virginia	6,015	61,176
Washington	4,648	47,273
West Virginia	1,876	19,080
Wisconsin	4,855	49,378
Wyoming	479	4,872
United States	245,807	\$2,500,000

(Data from U.S. Bureau of the Census:
Estimates of the Resident Population of
States on July 1, 1988.)



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS

Standing Committee on Planning

August 17, 1989

PL-89-4

President

JAMES P. FITZ
Director
Michigan Department
of Transportation

Committee Chairman

FREDERICK P. SALVUCCI
Massachusetts Executive Office
of Transportation and
Construction

Address reply to:

444 N. Capitol St., N.W.
Suite 225
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5800

To the Members of the Standing
Committee on Planning

Dear Members:

Attached is a survey which we are requesting that you complete regarding a consolidated approach by the states to purchase the 1990 census package for transportation. The purpose of the survey is to ascertain interest among SCOP members for participation in a joint procurement effort.

At the SCOP meeting in Boston, a Task Force was established to follow up on a proposal offered by Ohio DOT regarding a consolidated purchase. That Task Force, chaired by Henry Peyrebrune, New York DOT, has worked with staff from FHWA, the Bureau of the Census, and the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) to examine this issue.

The Task Force has found that a consolidated purchase would provide cost savings as well as significant time savings -- transportation-related census data would be available much earlier under this approach. Specifically, this approach could provide an expected cost savings of about 15 percent as well as provide the data 12-18 months earlier.

The total cost for the package would be \$2.5 million, or roughly a penny per capita. In the proposal under consideration, AASHTO or a lead state would contract with the Bureau of the Census for the \$2.5 million contract. States would then use HPR and/or PL funds or 100 percent state or local funds to fund the individual state share. Attachment A provides an estimate of the cost per state.

The 1990 Census Transportation Data Program will provide a significant amount of detailed data regarding place of employment. State and local agencies will have a much improved data base for use in both statewide and urban transportation planning and related economic development analysis, with much greater detail than has previously been available. This improved data will provide a stronger capability to examine trends, both in urban and rural areas. This better capability is possible due to a large scale effort by the Bureau of the Census and the MPO's to obtain journey to work data.

You will recall that in its Transportation 2020 effort AASHTO is proposing more flexibility for the states in administering intra-state federal highway and transit funds. This census data should give every state important information for administering such a flexible program.

The National Association of Regional Councils is working closely with AASHTO and FHWA with regard to 1990 census efforts, and is particularly interested in the development of a strong training program.

To overcome some regional problems that occurred with the 1980 census, the Bureau of the Census is centralizing its 1990 census activities to its Jeffersonville, Indiana office. This centralized approach is expected to provide a more accurate and consistent product throughout the nation.

Also attached is a letter and related material sent by the FHWA headquarters to the FHWA Regional offices concerning this issue. This information provides additional details for your consideration.

Please complete the attached survey form and return it to my attention at AASHTO by August 28. Once the survey responses have been analyzed, the Task Force will develop recommendations for consideration by the SCOP (possibly through a mail ballot) and by the AASHTO Policy Committee at the October AASHTO Annual meeting in Atlanta.

If you have questions, please call Ron Tweedie, New York DOT at 518-457-1965 or me. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely,

David H. Clawson

David H. Clawson
Secretary

DHC:djt
Attachments

444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 225
Washington, D.C. 20001

SURVEY OF INTEREST IN PARTICIPATION
IN
CENTRALIZED PURCHASE OF 1990 CENSUS DATA

Would your Department be interested in participation in an AASHTO-sponsored contract with the Bureau of the Census to provide Census Transportation Planning Packages for your state?

Yes _____

No _____

If no, please indicate why: _____

Would you be willing to act as agent for some or all of the MPO's in your state to consolidate their orders for such data and collect any required payments?

_____ Some, list exceptions _____

_____ All

_____ None

Which of the following fund sources would be desirable for payment of any costs?

FHWA HPR funds? Yes _____ No _____

FHWA PL funds? Yes _____ No _____

A mix of FHWA HPR and
PL funds? Yes _____ No _____

UMTA Section 8 funds? Yes _____ No _____

Other funds? (specify) _____

Signed _____

Member Department _____

Date _____

Please complete and return to Dave Clawson at the AASHTO Offices, 444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, by August 28, 1989.

DJT