## CATS 1990 Household Travel Survey

A Methodological Overview

Working Paper 94-05 by Anne C. Ghislandi Alan R. Fijal Ed J. Christopher

Chicago Area Transportation Study Information Services Division 300 West Adams Street Chicago, Illinois 60606 April 1994

#### Abstract

This report contains a methodological discussion of the CATS 1990 Household Travel Survey. It was prepared to assist those who are working with the Household Travel Survey data base. This report concentrates on the survey procedures and is intended to be a supplement to the materials that document the data base and its structure. It should be noted that a great deal has been written about the Household Travel Survey. This has been done both in terms of documenting the conduct of the survey and in the preparation of research papers covering several methodological aspects of the survey. Shown in the References at the end of this report is a listing of the published articles discussing various aspects of the survey. Copies of these articles are available by contacting CATS Public Information Officer.

#### Table of Contents

1.0	Background and Overview	Page . 1
2.0	Survey Technique	. 2
3.0	Sampling Frame	. 3
4.0	The Sample, Size and Selection	. 3
5.0	Survey Instrument, Household Form and Trip Form	. 5
	5.1 Survey Instrument	. 5
	5.2 Household Form	. 7
	5.3 Trip Form	. 9
6.0	Sampling Error and Bias	. 11
7.0	The University Role	. 13
8.0	Conclusion	. 14

#### List of Exhibits

#### Exhibit

Appei	ndices	
Refe	rences	21
6.	Percent of People Reporting Travel By Travel Day and Area Surveyed	20
5.	Map of Containment and Sampling Zones	19
4.	Number of Households Sampled Versus the Sampling Targets by Area	18
3.	Sample Sizes and Expected Errors	17
2.	Survey Features and Design	16
1.	Timeline for the CATS 1990 Household Travel Survey and Areas Surveyed	15

- A. Sample Survey Materials for the City of Chicago
- B. Sample Size Calculation for DuPage County

#### 1.0 Background and Overview

The collection and use of travel behavior data in the northeastern Illinois region by the Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS) has had a rich and illustrative history. The data itself has been culled largely from two sources: Data collected locally and data collected by the Census Bureau.

In 1956, CATS conducted a region-wide survey of household travel. This survey provided detailed origin-destination (O-D) data on trip purposes, modes of travel, trip lengths and travel patterns. In 1960, the U.S. Census Bureau initiated its first effort to collect journeyto-work (JTW) travel data in urbanized areas. For the next decennial census in 1970, the Census Bureau greatly improved the JTW data source. In conjunction with the Census Bureau's effort, CATS conducted its 1970 Home Interview Survey. This CATS effort had three main purposes: to provide a check on the census JTW data; to develop factors for areas where the census data was incomplete; and to provide O-D travel information on non-work related travel. There were, of course, many other secondary uses of the CATS home interview survey data. For 1980, the Census Bureau made further improvements to its JTW survey and CATS performed an update of its 1970 database in 1979.

For the 1990 census, the JTW supplement was further fine tuned and improved. Having worked with three prior census JTW databases (1960, 1970 and 1980), CATS understood the need to augment the census information with data on non-work related travel. To meet this need, CATS once again embarked upon a household travel survey, formally called the CATS 1990 Household Travel Survey (HHTS).

The HHTS encompassed a seven-year effort that produced a body of information on both work and non-work trips. Under the scope of the project, CATS surveyed the region on a county-by-county basis with the Chicago Central Business District (CBD) and the remainder of Chicago being surveyed separately. Starting in 1988, nine separate surveys were planned and conducted over a period of four years. The remaining years of the effort were spent on preparing and packaging the final data base for public distribution. Exhibit 1 following the text of this report contains the timeline for the areas surveyed.

The survey featured a self-administered mail-back questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed in a manner to allow the results to be adjusted and factored with the 1990 census. Specifically, the questionnaire collected two types of data: census variables such as the number of persons per household, age, vehicle availability, sex, employment status, occupation and income; and transportation related variables including trip origin and destination, trip purpose, travel time, mode of travel used, vehicle occupancy, and walking distance if transit modes were involved. Exhibit 2 presents an outline of the survey design and its features.

Once all the data was collected and put into a digital format researchers from the University of Illinois at Chicago undertook the task of bias reduction and factoring. Armed with the 1990 census journey-to-work package, the researchers factored, adjusted and, when completed, will certify the data base. A great deal of work has been undertaken on this aspect including a survey of travel survey factoring methods used by other metropolitan areas, research into the end uses of the data and an analysis of survey returns and bias reduction methods. Several published research papers on the conduct of the survey, its method and the factoring technique have also been published.

#### 2.0 <u>Survey Technique</u>

All survey techniques are the result of compromises among the objectives of the survey, the resources available and the amount of data to be collected. For the HHTS three different techniques were reviewed: a self-administered mail-back questionnaire or travel diary, a face-to-face home interview and a telephone interview. During the methodology review process many items were evaluated including the survey objectives, anticipated costs and effectiveness of each technique, and the experiences of other regions. Resulting from this evaluation the self-administered mail-back technique emerged as the most attractive for CATS' purposes.

CATS staff believed that the strengths of the mail-back travel diary were the ability to collect the desired data, lower costs and the ability to conduct it with existing staff and agency resources. Its weakness was the possibility of unknown biases. At the time of this investigation CATS only found limited evidence of the use of this technique so little was known about the type of bias to expect. This was a major concern of CATS and it is discussed in several subsequent sections.

As it turned out only minimal biases were detected and minor adjustments were made. The self administered mail-back technique seems to have its roots in work done in Germany, and in Albany and Ithaca, New York. The upstate New York work was done in the early 1980's and the results of which were reported at the Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting in 1984. Researchers Werner Brog of Germany and Arnim Meyburg, who has ties to Cornell University in Ithica, New York, have done much of the premier work with this technique.

The self-administered mail-out mail-back survey technique, as administered by CATS had four main elements: distribution of an introduction letter to selected households; distribution of the questionnaire and instructions; mailing out reminder letters; and telephoning selected individuals to verify their information. A sample copy of the materials distributed in the households in the Chicago portion of the survey is shown in Appendix A.

#### 3.0 <u>Sampling Frame</u>

The target population for the HHTS was the residents of northeastern Illinois who were 14 years old or older. To reach the target population, the sampling unit was the household rather than individuals. The main reason for using households rather than individuals rests with the level at which transportation planning takes place. Through CATS' experience with travel forecasting, it has been found that the household is currently the best predictor of travel behavior and thus, the basic unit of travel. Although changes to this paradigm are under investigation, it will literally be decades before alternative approaches become fully operational. Within the research community three approaches to travel forecasting and modeling are emerging. They include activity based, dynamic and individualized simulation approaches.

The universe that was used to draw the survey sample, or the sampling frame, was residential electric meters (addresses) supplied by Commonwealth Edison. This listing was successfully used for the 1970 Home Interview Survey and is frequently used by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission for its work. For areas where Commonwealth Edison addresses were not available, specifically the cities of Naperville, St. Charles, Batavia, Geneva and Winnetka, Illinois and sections of unincorporated Kane county, residential addresses were obtained from other sources. These include reverse telephone directories and municipal government files. For a detailed explanation of the source used to identify survey residents, please consult the area reports cited in the Reference section of this report.

#### 4.0 The Sample, Size and Selection

During the development of the HHTS the question of sample size was one of the most difficult questions to resolve. To help resolve the issue two approaches were pursued. First staff developed sample size estimates. The sample size estimates were based on the assumption of a standard deviation of the sample mean. In addition, it was further assumed that a little over half this basic variation could be explained by suitable stratification where the corresponding explanatory variables are known (e.g. persons per household, vehicle availability, workers per household, etc.) resulting in a smaller residual standard deviation of 0.75. The sample size calculations were based on this number, and the results are presented in Exhibit 3. These assumptions held for several items, including household trip rates, average trip length and mode.

The second tack was to assume the sample size and discuss it with the research community. A matrix was developed of various examples trading off sample size, several expected response rates, postage and processing costs along with staff resources. Through these two approaches it was determined that a database of 400 completed household questionnaires should be sufficient to represent any

geographic area that one would want to speak about. This value was then discussed with the researchers responsible for the factoring and adjusting. They confirmed it as being a sufficient number to produce results that they could work with. It was also initially assumed that a 20% response rate could be expected. Based upon a cumulation of experience this rate was surpassed in several suburban areas.

From that point on 400 households became the established number of completed household questionnaires needed to produce acceptable results. This meant that statistical reliability could be achieved for any geographical area by collecting data from 400 households. This then became the basis for the survey. Although 400 was the sample target in any given area, staff processed all the questionnaires that were returned. Since targets were exceeded in 98 percent of the areas surveyed this yielded a higher level of reliability than the original targets. Exhibit 4 shows the households surveyed, the sample targets and the number of usable surveys.

Once the desired sample size was known a sample had to be drawn. Although many different methods exist, a simple clustered random sample technique was used. This will be explained below. As noted, an early decision was made to conduct the survey and the sampling on a county by county basis. The decision was also made to develop subzones within each county sampled. These subzones acted in essence as containment areas in case something went wrong during the survey process. These subzones were drawn up to respect survey township boundaries and a map of them is shown as Exhibit 5. As it turned out these zones proved most useful in the city of Chicago where early low response rate indications in two subzones led to a selection of additional households.

Maintaining 400 as the target number of responses needed and using the assumed 20 percent response rate, a two stage sampling process was employed. The first stage consisted of developing the sampling frame, or universe of households, for each containment area or sub zone. This was accomplished by sorting the household addresses provided by Commonwealth Edison with a geographic code, which corresponds to the quarter-section where the electrical transformer of the residence is located. In the cases where alternate sampling frames had to be used, the sampling frame was sorted by the street address.

The file for each zone was then divided into approximately equal groups. The size of the group was derived by dividing the total number of units in the sampling frame for each zone by the number of survey questionnaires that were to be mailed (approximately 2,000 per zone if one assumes a 20 percent response). Before dividing the universe into groups, the number of households in each group was rounded to the nearest whole number. Once the geographically sorted groups were developed, one record was randomly selected from each group. The calculations for this step are shown in Appendix B for DuPage County. In the case of the telephone directory listings, the same process was employed except that the street address was used for sorting purposes. Since the Commonwealth Edison files contained some vacant and nonresidential units an edit of selected records took place whereby these units were removed. This edit, coupled with the rounding of the number of groups, accounted for the slightly different number of surveys being distributed in each sampling zone. However it must be noted that according to the sample design, it was acceptable to have a different number of households surveyed for each zone as long as at least 400 samples per zone were returned and usable. Therefore, the mailing to each sampling zone was more or less than the targeted 2,000 questionnaires needed to achieve a 20 percent response. In addition to deleting obvious "bad" records, the selected records were edited to correct misspellings and other anomalies. Unique identification numbers were then assigned to the questionnaires and mailing labels were produced. Exhibit 4 presents a summary of the households selected.

#### 5.0 Survey Instrument, Household Form and Trip Form

This section is intended to provide insight into the survey instrument, specifically the questionnaire, the logic behind its design, and the use of the data. Appendix B contains a copy of the materials mailed to the selected households including the questionnaire. The questionnaire is divided into two sections: a household form that identifies the characteristics of the household and its members; and a trip form that identifies the characteristics of each trip. Those working with the HHTS data files also need to review the Data Base Documentation presented in CATS Working Paper 94-05.

#### 5.1 <u>Survey Instrument</u>

The households selected to participate in the survey received three mailings. The first contact was to mail two introduction letters. These were sent two weeks prior to the mailing of the survey package. The first letter was written by a local government official, usually the county board chairman. It explained the goals of the survey and the importance of cooperation and introduced CATS. The second letter was from CATS' Executive Director and focused on the mechanics of the survey. Although the net effect of the dual letters is unknown, staff felt that showing local support added credibility to the effort.

Two weeks after the introduction letters were mailed, the survey packet arrived. The mailings of the survey packets were timed to arrive on a Tuesday or Wednesday, approximately one day before the travel day. Referring to Appendix B, one can see that the packet was loaded with instructions. It was accompanied by a postage-paid return envelope. The questionnaire format drew heavily from one used in Ithaca, New York. Although the questionnaire was self-administered it asked for the respondent's name and telephone number to allow for follow-up telephone calls. The ability to make follow-up telephone calls was most important and proved very valuable during the editing stage. Many times an entire household's worth of data could be salvaged with a simple telephone call to resolve a questionable response. Depending on the area surveyed between 5 percent and 7 percent of the respondent households were called back. In general it was the opinion of the staff that conducted the edit of the returned questionnaires that most respondent household's had limited difficulty completing the survey forms.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information regarding household size, composition, employment status, vehicle availability and household income before asking the respondent to complete the travel/trip records. Prior to completing the trip records the respondents were asked to assign a "person number" to each household member (14 years and older) based on age with the oldest person listed as Person 1, the next oldest as Person 2, etc. They also provided their sex, age, relationship to the oldest person in the household, employment status and current occupation. Using the assigned person number, the respondents were then asked to note whether or not each person traveled on the reference (travel) day. If the person traveled, s/he was asked to provide the details for each trip in sequential order. This included the origin and destination, travel time, purpose and mode. In addition, there were several questions regarding walk links to and from all transit trips.

As suggested earlier, this data was collected and represents a reference day as opposed to a typical day. It was decided early on by CATS staff that collecting the travel data for a reference day would be adequate. By taking a "snapshot" of people's travel for one day the data can then be adjusted according to the type of analysis being pursued. Since two of the stated goals were to capture non-work and linked trips, which usually involve a work trip end it was decided that Thursday would be the optimal business day. It is a well established fact that midweek is the best time to study work trips but Thursday is also a shopping day in the northeastern Illinois region. On Thursday night most establishments that are not typically opened at night are open.

Once the questionnaires were mailed and five days after the travel day, a reminder letter was sent to the non-responding households. Since the original travel day had passed, the reminder letter instructed the respondent to use either of the following two Thursdays as an alternate travel day. The reminder letters proved very helpful and netted an added response ranging from 12 percent to 22 percent. A summary of the responses by travel day and area can be found in Exhibit 6.

Early on in the surveys an unanticipated trend in the use of the travel date had developed. Upon receiving the first wave of completed forms from residents of the CBD it was found that several respondents reported their travel for the Thursday a week before the "official" travel day. After reviewing these forms and comparing them with the trip forms received for the subsequent Thursdays, it was decided that the data was usable. Thus, Exhibit 6 shows four travel days per area.

The next two sections present a detailed summary of many of the issues asked of the respondents. This discussion follows the structure of the questionnaire to make it easier to follow with the forms. As noted there were two basic forms, the household and trip forms.

#### 5.2 Household Form

The first group of questions on the form asked the respondent to identify how many people live in the household and how many are 14 years old or older. The choice to collect trip information from those 14 and older was a policy decision made by CATS planning staff. With a minor adjustment, this data can be comparable with the Census Bureau's data which uses 16 years and older for reporting travel. For historical reference, the 1970 CATS home interview survey collected travel data from each household member 16 years of age or older.

The next item solicited was the number of vehicles owned or kept at home for use by household members. Finally, a telephone number and a household member's first name was requested so that follow-up telephone calls would be possible. Although this information was solicited on the household form, it does not appear on any of the files related to the survey. It has been edited out to assure the confidentiality of the respondents.

There are several issues to understand regarding the question on vehicle inventory. The 1970 CATS survey sought to collect the number of vehicles kept at the housing unit and used by household members by asking specifically, "What is the number of vehicles owned or garaged at this location?" If clarification was needed, the interviewer added the concept of "cars kept and used". The face-to-face interview technique used in 1970 made clarification possible. In 1980, the Census Bureau asked for a vehicle inventory through the use of two separate questions.

The 1990 census asked the question "How many automobiles, vans and trucks of one-ton capacity or less are kept at home for use by members of your household?" For the household travel survey, CATS broadened the concept of vehicle inventory to include motorcycles, bicycles and any other vehicle types kept at home for use. By broadening the response criteria, the HHTS collected the exact information that the census collected plus additional information on modes of travel that tended to be associated with non-work related travel.

The next several items on the questionnaire made up the "individual profile" and include age, relationship to the oldest person in the household, sex, school enrollment, employment status, and occupation information. These items are consistent not only with the census data, but also with the CATS 1970 data as well. The section of the "individual profile" entitled employment status requires some clarification. When designing the questionnaire there was a great deal of discussion regarding employment status. It was decided that for trip generation purposes there needed to be a means to identify individuals who are employed and those who are not employed. However, after asking for this information from CBD household members, it became clear that an individual could be both employed and retired at the same time. Also, it was acknowledged that knowing the individuals' complete employment status provides useful information for editing the trip forms and ensures the attainment of the most detailed information while providing a means to identify workers and non-workers.

So, to obtain more detailed information, while providing a means to identify workers and nonworkers, an editing step was added to the coding process. Presented below is an outline of the steps and logic used to perform this edit. With this edit, it became possible to identify those individuals who were employed full and/or part time) as well as those who were not. Being able to break down the information this way made it possible to summarize the number of work trips made by each employed individual.

A. Employed Full-Time. It was totally acceptable for an individual to check this box and not have reported any work trips. However if a "work" or "work related" destination activity (trip purpose) was given, either the "employed full-time" or "employed part-time" box had to be checked. This box could be checked in combination with any of the other boxes.

B. Employed Part-Time. Same logic as employed full-time.

C. Homemaker. This is the first category that required close examination. If this box alone is checked, the editor was instructed to make sure that no "work" or "travel related to work" trips were made. If a work trip was reported, a determination was made (using the length of time at the work location) as to whether the individual was also a full or part-time worker. If this could not be determined, a telephone call was made to the respondent.

D. Student. Same logic as homemaker.

E. Unemployed. Under no circumstances could someone check this box in conjunction with either of the two boxes indicating employment. However, this box could be checked in combination with Homemaker, Student, Retired and/or Other. Additionally, if this box was checked, there could not be any trips with a destination activity of "work" or "travel related to work".

F. Retired. Same logic as homemaker.

G. Other. Same logic as homemaker.

The last item to the "individual profile" was the respondent's current occupation. A concern in designing the survey was whether to obtain the respondent's current occupation, or the industry in which the respondent worked. The question arose as to whether industry information was needed for transportation planning purposes. In this light, there were two issues that must be clarified. First, occupation was not intended to be a travel forecasting variable but instead was asked as a controlling variable capable of being linked back to the census. Second, the forecasting process does not look at the home-end (trip productions) for the variable "Industry". This variable comes into play during the trip distribution phase and is associated with the trip attraction side of the distribution equation. In short, the worker's industry is not a home-based variable, but instead is an employer based variable. Consequently, it was beyond the focus of the household travel survey, and the survey only requests occupation information.

The last item on the household form asked for household income before taxes. One of the most difficult data items to collect, household income typically receives the most incomplete responses. Consequently, income information was asked for at the end of the form as a means of minimizing the impact of asking for it. In other words, its placement was meant to allow respondents to decide whether or not to report income while still having completed the majority of questions. As the questionnaire evolved it was decided that household income would not be a factoring variable. Thus, in all but the CBD and McHenry forms it was asked as an optional item. Although it was optional, only 19 percent of the responding households did not answer this question. This yielded a highly acceptable completion rate overall.

Another goal when designing the survey as it related to the income issue was to develop specific income brackets that would be compatible with the 1990 census. However, because the Bureau of the Census did not develop its brackets until after the census was completed, compatibility on this item could not be ensured. Thus, the brackets used do not exactly mirror the census and further aggregation of Census data is necessary for comparability. Another income adjustment to consider would be to correct for the spread of years in which the survey was administered. Although travel behavior changes little on a yearly basis, some feel that this is not the case for income issues.

#### 5.3 Trip Form

The trip form was designed with the goal of minimizing confusion on the part of the respondent while collecting the needed information. A copy of the trip form can be found in Appendix B. Check-off answers were provided wherever possible.

To provide a link between trips, the last question asked the respondent "Did you go anywhere else after this trip?" If the "Yes" box was checked, an arrow was provided to steer the respondent to the next trip . This way the trips were linked in such a way as to eliminate the need to duplicate the destination of one trip as the origin of the next trip. Consequently, just the destination of the next trip was requested, eliminating the confusing "from and to" issue for the respondent. To begin the trip chain, the respondent was asked "Where did you start your first trip?": "Home" or "Elsewhere... Specify". Since the forms were serialized, staff already knew the home location.

Each trip form contained enough space to report on 7 trips. As noted, a separate form was to be completed for each household member 14 years of age or older. Respondents were asked to indicate the "person number" of the household member for whom the trip form applied. Four household members were identified (pre-coded). Additional unnumbered trip forms were included to allow for either additional trips by persons 1, 2, 3 or 4 or trips by additional household members.

A standard CATS convention was used for coding the trip origins and destinations. Trips within the six-county region were coded down to the quarter-section level of detail. For trips outside the region, a code was used which represents a state/city coding scheme (FIPS state and census place codes were used). This code begins with two '9's followed by a 2-digit FIPS state code and the 4-digit census place code. The city and state codes can be found in many Census Bureau products most notably <u>1980 Census of Population and Housing Geographic Identification Codes</u>, PHC 80-R5 U.S. Department of Commerce, April 1983. Once city codes were assigned, latitude and longitude were derived from several files which CATS maintains. Trip distances and speeds were then calculated from the coordinates.

Looking closely at the form, one can see that what is commonly referred to as the trip purpose is listed on the trip form under the heading of "Destination Activity." The question reads "Why did you go to this destination?" When designing the trip form, an attempt was made to improve on past efforts while assuring some compatibility with them. Specifically, the trip purpose category (now destination activity) identified in CATS' 1970 survey as "personal business" was eliminated. Experience has shown that personal business trip purposes tend to be confused by those who are self-employed. Further, because of the "catchall" nature of the variable, trips that should more precisely be reported as shopping or recreation tend to be reported as personal business. As a result, a category entitled "Other" was added in place of personal business. Several tests and past survey work have demonstrated that this is an acceptable way of dealing with overreported personal business travel. The new categories can be collapsed reasonably into the 1970 Home Interview "personal business" category to facilitate direct comparisons.

Another destination activity to note is "change type of transportation". This activity was included to make the respondents report each segment of a multi-modal trip separately. When using this data for transportation modeling and forecasting, the analyst must combine trip segments to conform to the traditional trip circuits used by the models.

Other items on the trip form include the date for which travel was reported, the time and location of each trip, the number of blocks walked if transit modes were used and the number of persons in the auto, van or truck if the trip was made by any of those modes. Another point to note is that for all trips that were made on a school bus, a check was performed to assure that the destination activity was valid.

One other item that should be noted relates to the type of transportation used for a particular trip. For transportation planning purposes, pickups and vans can be considered synonymous with automobiles. This classification is consistent with the way the Census Bureau counts vehicles.

#### 6.0 <u>Sampling Error and Bias</u>

A discussion of the sampling procedures and concepts would not be complete without an acknowledgment of error and bias and how it was handled. Even with the best methodology and design, sampling error and bias must be recognized, understood and dealt with. Throughout the conduct of the HHTS this was a major concern of CATS. Presented below is a discussion of the various types of error and bias and the steps taken to combat them.

Sample Error is the error that occurs because the survey is dealing with a sample and not the total population. No matter how well a sample is designed, error can always occur. As a result, the largest feasible sample size was drawn. (Refer to the sample size discussion elsewhere in this report.) Although sample error can be assumed to be minimal the data user should always be aware that it may exist. To check for obvious errors when choosing the sample, maps were produced and examined identifying the locations of the households that were selected.

Sampling Bias, on the other hand, arises because of mistakes in choosing the sampling frame or the survey method. Data falsification, and nonresponse effects can also cause sampling bias. Early in the design of the HHTS it was assumed that the sampling frame and survey method would be adequate. The use of Commonwealth Edison residential electric meter addresses had been used in the past with good results. As for the survey method, a review of the literature and consultation with several national experts in the survey field who had experience with this technique helped support staffs' confidence. In terms of data falsification a structured manual edit was performed. With this done the focus of the bias investigation shifted to nonresponse effects.

Several steps were taken to assure that nonresponse bias did not jeopardize the validity of the survey. Foremost on this list was the use of reminder letters. Since the questionnaires were serialized it was possible to send out targeted reminder letters to non responding households. Although some argue that this has little affect on response rates the use of this technique for the HHTS proved successful. To support this contention review Exhibit 6 which shows how many households reported travel by travel day.

Another technique was to look at the response rates at a small geographic level to determine if any spatial bias existed. By

comparing the residents' home locations with those in the total population, it was possible to determine if the nonresponse was spatially based. The results of this analysis did yield some nonresponse bias which was easily accounted for and documented in <u>Factoring Household Travel Surveys</u>, National Academy Press, Transportation Research Board, January 1993.

Another means for dealing with nonresponse was to check to see if any tail-end factoring was needed. According to the theory nonresponders more closely represent the late responders or those who responded as a result of prodding. In the case of the HHTS the prodding was accomplished with the reminder letters. As a means to determine if any tail-end factoring was needed staff from the University of Illinois examined the trip circuits produced by the respondents by the date in which they reported their travel. The results of this research showed that there was no significant difference between the on time and late respondents. Thus, it was decided that tail-end factoring was not needed. The results of this effort can found in <u>Nonresponse Bias and Trip Generation Models</u>, National Academy Press, Transportation Research Board, 1993.

The type of nonresponse examined above dealt with total nonresponse. That is the whole household did not respond. However, another type of nonresponse that concerned CATS was item nonresponse. This is much harder to detect and it can grossly affect the results. Item nonresponse is where someone in the household forgot a trip or did not respond to all the questions. CATS took two approaches to deal with this issue.

First, a great deal of effort went into the preparation of the survey instrument and its related instructions and forms. One form was included that listed over 60 potential trip purposes ranging from "airport" trips to "visit friend". This sheet was set up as a check list and can be found in Appendix A.

The second safeguard to item nonresponse, specifically missed trips, fell between the quality of the editing and the layout of the form. It was the contention of the editing crew that an experienced editor could spot a trip form with missing trips. The layout of the form also contributed to reducing item nonresponse especially when one considers that the respondent had to put both a start and end time on the form. This allowed for successive chain building since all the hours of the day had to be covered.

In terms of item nonresponse where whole individuals did not report, two issues played off each other. On the household form the respondent was asked to put down the total number of people in the household so the editor could check the trip makers against the residents. The other side of this was in the way the data was factored using the 1990 Census. One of the variables used in the factoring scheme was the number of people in the household as reported by the Census Bureau. In terms of factoring the HHTS this will be discussed in subsequent documents produced by the University of Illinois who conducted this task.

#### 7.0 The University Role

When the HHTS was being designed it was a well recognized fact that when complete, the survey data base would have to be factored up to the population. It was further understood that it may have to be adjusted to account for any bias that crept into the study. Recognizing that this work would need to be done, CATS approached the Urban Transportation Center (UTC) of the University of Illinois to solicit their interest in the study. It was the general opinion that the final product would have a higher degree of credibility attached to if it were factored and adjusted by "the experts" The UTC assigned a senior ranking transportation statistician professor and a noted geographer to the project.

The UIC researchers laid out six tasks related to factoring and adjusting the travel data. They included a literature review, identification of end uses for the data, developing a data base and information system, conducting the bias reduction, factoring the data, and preparing the final data sets. Below is a brief discussion of their work.

A literature search relating to bias reduction, factoring and travel surveys was undertaken early in the project. In addition to the literature search, a survey of twenty-three large metropolitan planning agencies (MPOs) throughout the country was conducted to determine what methods they used in factoring their travel surveys. The results indicated that eleven had used some method of factoring and six of those used specific demographic variables from the Census to scale the survey data up to the population.

As part of the second task, UIC inventoried the end uses and users of the data. A final report has been completed and is cited in the References section of this report. Also, as part of this task, a theoretical analysis of sample size calculations was performed. The next task centered on the form and medium of the final data sets with an eye to how the data could be stored and retrieved. It was decided early on that the data base would be PC based and available 'free of charge' to the member agencies of the MPO.

Although several methods were under consideration it soon became obvious that three major files consisting of a household file, a person file and a trip file would emerge. With this design, it will be possible to analyze and use each file separately or in combination. It should be pointed out that this format follows very closely the structure of the National Personal Transportation Survey (NPTS) produced by the Federal Highway Administration.

#### 8.0 <u>Conclusion</u>

The preceding discussion was intended to assist the users of the HHTS with their understanding of how the survey was put together. It is CATS desire that the data files developed as part of the HHTS receive widespread use in both planning and analytical studies. CATS invites comments on every aspect of this data set including format, data file structure, processing environments and the general utility of the data itself. Further, CATS is interested in knowing how the data is being used and what analytical results have been found. The Information Services Division will collect analyses done by CATS staff and other recipients as part of its data clearing house function. Please send summaries of analyses of this data to the Director of the Information

#### <u>Timeline for the CATS 1990 Household</u> <u>Travel Survey and Areas Surveyed</u>

- \* Chicago's CBD--Fall 1988
- \* McHenry County--Spring 1989
- \* Lake County--Fall 1989
- \* DuPage County--Spring 1990
- \* Kane, Will and Kendall Counties--Fall 1990
- \* Suburban Cook County--Spring 1991
- \* Chicago--Fall 1991

## CATS 1990 Household Travel Survey Features and Design

*	Self Administered Mail-Out Mail-Back
*	Targets Individuals at Their Homes
*	Sampled from Electric Meter Addresses
*	Collected Travel and Demographic Data
*	Travel Data Obtained for Those 14 and Older
*	Questionnaire Used Trip Diary Concept
*	Sought Travel for a Reference Day (Thursday)
*	Emphasized Walking To / From Transit Trips
*	Focused on Non-Work Travel
*	Solicited Respondent's Phone Number for Follow-up Interviews
*	Utilized Reminder Letters for Late Respondents
*	Successfully Undertaken in Other Areas Here and Abroad
*	Conducted In-house with CATS Staff

#### Sample Sizes and Expected Errors

<u>Sample Size</u>	Standard Error <u>of the Mean</u>	Error at 95% Confidence Level
225	.0500	.098
400	.0375	.074
600	.0306	.060
800	.0265	.052
1000	.0237	.046
1600	.01875	.037
3200	.01326	.026

Source: Chicago Area Transportation Study, Sam Hadfield, 1988

#### <u>Number of Households Sampled Verses the</u> <u>Sampling Targets by Area</u>

<u>Area (Zones)</u>	<u>Sample</u>	Target	<u>Usable</u>
CBD (1)	1,869	400	404
McHenry (3)	6,948	1,200	2,004
Lake (5)	9,143	2,000	2,480
DuPage (9)	17,586	3,600	5,098
Kane (3)	5,886	1,200	1,741
Will (2)	4,079	800	896
Kendall (1)	2,038	400	694
Sub. Cook (7)	14,037	2,800	3,675
Chicago* (6)	<u>17,760</u>	2,400	<u>2,321</u>
Total (37)	79,346	14,800	19,314

\* Excludes CBD



## Percent of People Reporting Travel By Travel Days and Area Surveyed

Area	<u>Alternate 1</u>	Assigned Day	<u>Alternate 2</u>	<u>Alternate 3</u>	<u>Number</u>
CBD	12.5	60.8	10.7	16.0	513
McHenry	8.3	64.8	19.1	7.8	3,938
Lake	2.7	73.6	18.4	5.3	4,727
DuPage	5.4	74.4	13.0	7.3	9,862
Kane	1.4	78.4	12.6	7.7	3,470
Will	3.1	76.8	12.9	7.2	1,704
Kendall	3.1	77.2	11.7	8.0	1,382
Sub. Co	ok 1.0	78.9	15.3	4.9	6,731
Chicago	6.4	66.6	16.6	10.3	3,862

.

#### <u>References</u>

- 1. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume One: Documentation for the Chicago's Central Business District</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, September 1989.
- 2. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Two: Documentation for the</u> <u>McHenry County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, March 1990.
- 3. "Transportation Facts", CATS Household Travel Survey Chicago's CBD and McHenry County, Volume 7, Number 2, Chicago Area Transportation Study, May 1990.
- 4. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Three: Documentation for the</u> <u>Lake County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, August 1990.
- 5. <u>Literature Review of Non-Response Bias in Transportation Planning</u> <u>Data-Sets</u>, Urban Transportation Center, University of Illinois at Chicago, Interim Report Task 1, February 1991.
- 6. "Transportation Facts", CATS Household Travel Survey Lake and DuPage Counties, Volume 8, Number 3, Chicago Area Transportation Study, November 1991.
- 7. <u>End Uses of CATS' Travel Data: Information for Factoring</u>, Urban Transportation Center, University of Illinois at Chicago, Interim Report: Task 2a, December 1991.
- 8. <u>Summary Report of Metropolitan Travel Surveys</u>, Urban Transportation Center, University of Illinois at Chicago, Interim Report, March 1992.
- 9. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Four: Documentation for the</u> <u>DuPage County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, August 1992.
- 10. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Five: Documentation for the</u> <u>Will County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, December 1992.
- 11. <u>Factoring Household Travel Surveys</u>, Transportation Research Board, Research Record Number 1412, National Academy Press January 1993.
- 12. <u>Non-Response Bias and Trip Generation Models</u>, Transportation Research Board, Research Record 1412, National Academy Press, January 1993.

- 13. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Six: Documentation for the</u> <u>Suburban Cook County Area</u>, May 1993.
- 14. "Transportation Facts", CATS Household Travel Survey Suburban Cook County and City of Chicago, Volume 10, Number 2, Chicago Area Transportation Study, April 1993.
- 15. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Eight: Documentation for the</u> <u>Kane County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, July 1993.
- 16. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Nine: Documentation for the Kendall County Area</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study, July 1993.
- 17. "Transportation Facts", CATS Household Travel Survey Kane, Kendall and Will Counties, Volume 10, Number 4, Chicago Area Transportation Study, July 1993.
- 18. <u>Shopping Trip Chains: Current Patterns and Changes Since 1970</u>, Presented at the Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting, January 1994.
- 19. <u>1990 CATS Household Travel Survey, Technical Documentation for</u> <u>the Household, Person and Trip Files</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study Working Paper 94-04, April 1994.
- 20. <u>1990 CATS Household Travel Survey, A Methodological Overview</u>, Chicago Area Transportation Study Working Paper 94-05, April 1994.
- 21. <u>CATS Household Travel Survey, Volume Seven: Documentation for</u> <u>City of Chicago</u> (In production).

~ι

#### APPENDIX A

## Sample of Survey Materials Mailed to Selected Households



#### City of Chicago Richard M. Daley, Mayor

#### Department of Public Works

John N. LaPlante Acting Commissioner

Richard G. Hankett Deputy Commissioner

Bureau of Transportation Planning and Programming Room 411 320 North Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60610 (312) 744-7767 FAX (312) 744-3958

#### September 19, 1991

Dear Chicago Resident:

The Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS) will soon begin a comprehensive study to update existing data on the travel patterns and characteristics of Chicago residents. Yours, along with 17,000 other households, has been randomly selected to participate in this citywide travel survey.

We have all become increasingly aware of the important role that transportation plays in our daily lives. Over the past several years, travel patterns and characteristics have changed significantly. Given these changes, there is no up-to-date information on how we get to and from work, shopping, school or to our parks and recreation areas. The results of the travel survey will provide valuable insight as to how travel patterns have changed in the city of Chicago.

In the next few weeks you will be receiving a survey package and a set of instructions in the mail. The package will contain a questionnaire that will ask how you and your family travel on a typical weekday. I want to stress that your name, address and the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only.

I would encourage you to take the few minutes necessary to read and respond to the questionnaire. Your participation is very important and will be most appreciated.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Ed Christopher of CATS at (312) 793-3467. For your convenience CATS has also established a toll free number 1-800-637-9125. Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

John N. LaPlante Acting Commissioner



CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY 300 West Adams Street Chicago Illinois 60606

September 19, 1991

Dear Chicago Resident:

As Mr. LaPlante explained, we are embarking on a most important travel survey. This survey is especially important since it provides some of the data needed to develop transportation facilities to serve your needs.

During the initial planning of the travel survey, many people have asked who is doing this work. What is the Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS)? In short, CATS is a public agency with transportation planning responsibilities for northeastern Illinois.

CATS was organized late in 1955 by the city of Chicago, Cook County and the State of Illinois, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads. CATS' mission was to develop a transportation plan for the evergrowing metropolitan area. Once the original transportation plan was published in 1962, CATS took on the role of updating the region's transportation plan at ten year intervals.

In addition to CATS, many entities plan for different parts of the transportation system in the region. Each county, municipality, and the Illinois Department of Transportation do transportation related planning. The planning efforts of these agencies are coordinated by the Chicago Area Transportation Study. Without CATS providing this coordinating function, many federally funded transportation projects could not be planned or implemented.

I urge you to follow Mr. LaPlante's encouragement and participate in the travel survey, the importance of which has been discussed in the attached letter. We will be contacting you shortly with forms and instructions. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Ed Christopher of our office at 1-800-637-9125 (it's toll free).

Thank you.

Aristide E. Biciunas Executive Director

AEB:ls

POLICY COMMITTEE: KIRK BROWN-CHAIRMAN, Secretary, Illinois Department of Transportation DENNIS VALY-VICE CHAIRMAN, President, Village of New Lenox, Representing Council of Mayors, LAURA A. JIBBEN, Executive Director, Representing Regional Transportation Authority SHELLA A. SCHULTZ, President, Northeasern Illinois Planning Commission DAVID S. WILLIAMS, JR., Commissioner, Department of Public Works, Representing City of Chicage ORDERT L. HEDRICK, Chief Engineer, Highway Department, Representing City of Chicage ORDERT L. HEDRICK, Chief Engineer, Highway Department, Representing Caunty DONALD G. ZEILENGA, Director, Division of Transportation, Representing City of Chicage ORDERT L. HEDRICK, Chief Engineer, Highway Department, Representing Kane County ROBERT DEPKE, Chairman, Lake County JAMES R. RAKOW, Superintendent of Highway, Representing MeHenry County ROY S. COUSINS, Supernstendent of Highways, Representing Will County ALFRED H. SAVAGE, Executive Director, Representing Chicago Transit Authority MICHAEL W. PAYETTE, Vice President, Chicago & North Western Transportation Company, Representing Raitroad Companies JEFFREY E. LADD, Chairman, Constnuer Rail Board (Mera) JOHN D. RITA, Chairman, South Suburban Mass Transport, Representing Privat Transportation Providers FLORENCE H. BOONE, Chairman, Suburban Bus Board (Pace) ROBERT L. HICKMAN, Executive Director, Representing Unitan Mass Transport, Representing Drivat TIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transport, Representing Divistation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transport, Representing Divistation ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transportation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transportation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transportation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Chicago Area Transportation State



CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY 300 West Adams Street Chicago Illinois 60606

October, 1991

Dear Chicago Resident:

Approximately two weeks ago you received a letter indicating that your household had been randomly selected to participate in a citywide travel survey. This effort is designed to generate information which will be used to plan transportation improvements throughout northeastern Illinois during the next several years. Similar studies have been conducted in DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, Will and suburban Cook counties.

The objective of the survey is to identify all trips made by all members of your household, and by many other residents the city of Chicago, on a single travel day. Our survey covers all types of transportation including auto, bus, rail, airplane and even walking. There are some questions concerning your household and the people in it. The information you provide will be used to determine the travel patterns of typical residents of Chicago. Because we will be surveying only a small percentage of the population, it is important that those who have been selected do, indeed, respond. Even if you made only a few or no trips on the travel day, please complete the questionnaire. It is also important to hear from senior citizens and those persons who rarely travel. Any information you provide will remain confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only.

We trust that you will agree with us that the information obtained from this survey is important for planning future transportation facilities in Chicago and the suburbs. Only by collecting reliable information on travel patterns can we plan for the efficient movement of traffic within this region. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely.

Aristide E. Biciunas Executive Director

POLICY COMMITTEE: KIEK BROWN-CHAIRMAN, S IN DENNIS VALY-VICE CHAIRMAN. Council of Mayore, LAURA A. JIBBEN, E on Authority SHIKILA A. SCHULTZ, P DAVED & WILLIAMS, IR. OG ROBERT I., HEDRIC Cook County DONALD G. ZEILENGA, Di n of Top ng Kane County ROBERT DEPKE, Chairman, Lake County JAMES R. RAKOW, S ming Will County ALFRED H. SAVAGE. E IV BOY S. COLISIN MICHAEL W. PAYETTE, VI JEFFREY R. LADD. A JOHN D. RITA. C S FLORENCE H. BOONE, N ROBERT I HICKMAN E y Authority JAY W. MILLER, Division Ac IN JOEL P. ETTINGE ON ARISTIDE E. BICIUNAS-SECRETARY, Executive Director, Cl

Conducted for: Illinois Department of Transportation City of Chicago

Conducted by:

Chicago Area Transportation Study Survey Office (312)793-3467 Toll Free Number: 1-800-637-9125

# WHAT TO DO NOW

**SURVEY 1991** 

When completing this survey, you should

1. Fill out PARTS 1 & 2 of the HOUSEHOLD FORM.

**CITY OF** 

**CHICAGO** 

TRAVEL

- 2. Fill out a TRIP FORM for each person 14 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.
- 3. Have each of these people **RECORD ALL THE TRIPS** made on the household's **TRAVEL DAY** on these forms.

If any person is unable to complete the form, another household member should provide assistance.

The next page tells you how to fill out the TRIP FORMS.

- 4. Return the completed HOUSEHOLD FORMS and all completed TRIP FORMS in the enclosed POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE.
- 5. Please try to mail the forms on THE DAY AFTER your household's TRAVEL DAY and DO NOT return unused forms.

#### IMPORTANT! HOW TO FILL OUT THE TRIP FORMS

- o Please complete a **TRIP FORM** for every person in the household who is 14 years of age or older.
- o The OLDEST PERSON in the household should fill out TRIP FORM NUMBER 1, the SECOND OLDEST in the household should fill out TRIP FORM NUMBER 2, and so on.
- o Please fill in ALL THE TRIPS you make on this day.

YOUR HOUSEHOLD'S TRAVEL DAY IS:				
THIS COMING	THURSDAY			

- o You should complete the trip form ONLY for your household's TRAVEL DAY.
- 0 If you make NO TRIPS on the travel day, please give the REASON at the top of the trip sheet.
- A TRIP is defined as a ONE-WAY movement from one location to another. If you travel to a location and then return home, this is counted as TWO separate trips. If you travel to work and then a store and then return home, this is counted as THREE trips.
- 0 Be sure to report ALL trips, even those where WALKING is the only means of transportation.
- o Fill in ALL YOUR TRIPS starting at 4:00 AM on the TRAVEL DAY through 3:59 AM the next day.
- Every time you **RETURN HOME** during the course of the **TRAVEL DAY** be sure to record it on the trip sheet.
- o If someone in your household makes MORE THAN 7 TRIPS on the TRAVEL DAY, the Supplemental Trip Forms can be used. Please fill in the person number in the space provided at the top of the form.
- o If more than 4 people in your household make trips on the **TRAVEL DAY**, then use the Supplemental Trip Forms. Write the person number in the blank space at the top of the form.

#### ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK

- o ATTENTION CTA, Metra and Pace riders. TRANSIT USERS instructions are on the back of this page.
- ATTENTION truck, taxi, limo and bus drivers, persons who drive a company vehicle and persons who drive extensively on COMPANY BUSINESS. A simpler procedure is explained on the back of this page.
- o **ATTENTION persons who make LONG DISTANCE TRIPS** on the travel day. Instructions are on the back of this page.

#### CALL US IF YOU HAVE ANY OUESTIONS

If you have any problems or questions about this survey, please phone the Survey Office between 8:00 AM and 4:30 PM. Our telephone number is 312-793-3467 or you can call toll free at 1-800-637-9125. After 4:30 PM you can call our toll free number and leave a message on the answering machine. We will get back to you as soon as possible.

#### CTA, METRA AND PACE RIDERS

- o For each trip via CTA, Metra and Pace, please record, in the appropriate boxes, the number of **BLOCKS WALKED TO AND FROM THE BUS STOP OR TRAIN STATION**
- If you travel to a destination and transfer using a combination of CTA bus, CTA rapid transit, Metra commuter rail and/or Pace bus, each of these movements is to be reported as a separate trip. The DESTINATION ACTIVITY for transferring is CHANGE TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION.
- However, two or more CONSECUTIVE BUS RIDES (e.g. CTA #151 to CTA #60), RAPID
  TRANSIT RIDES (e.g. Howard/Englewood to Evanston), OR COMMUTER RAIL RIDES (e.g. CNW North Line to CNW West Line) should be COMBINED and recorded as a SINGLE TRIP.
- If you make a rail trip via CTA elevated or subway or a Metra commuter train, please report, as SEPARATE TRIPS, how you travel TO THE TRAIN STATION, THE ACTUAL TRAIN RIDE AND how you travel FROM THE TRAIN STATION. As you record these separate trips involving rail travel your DESTINATION ACTIVITY should be CHANGE TYPE of TRANSPORTATION. WHEN YOU ARRIVE at your destination, the DESTINATION ACTIVITY should be the ACTUAL REASON FOR TRAVELING (ex.work, work related, shopping, etc.).
- 0 A SAMPLE TRANSIT USER'S TRIP SHEET is included with the instruction sheets.

#### TRUCK. TAXI. BUS AND LIMO DRIVERS AND PERSONS WHO DRIVE WHILE ON THE JOB

- o Truck drivers SHOULD NOT REPORT any trips made on company business such as for pickups, deliveries or service calls.
- o Taxi, bus or limousine drivers SHOULD NOT REPORT trips to pick up, transport or drop off passengers.
- Persons who make sales calls or numerous local trips on company business SHOULD NOT REPORT these trips.
- o ALL of the above persons should report their TRIPS TO WORK AND FROM WORK. They should also report ALL TRIPS MADE WHILE NOT AT WORK during the remainder of the travel day.

#### PERSONS MAKING LONG DISTANCE TRIPS

- o For this survey, the CHICAGO REGION is comprised of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry and Will counties.
- o If you travel OUT OF OR INTO this region (e.g. Chicago, Il. to Milwaukee, Wisconsin or Milwaukee, Wisconsin to Chicago, Il.) these trips should be reported. Any trips that take place ENTIRELY OUTSIDE of the region (e.g.: Milwaukee to Madison to Janesville) should not be reported.
- o If you leave the region VIA AIRPLANE, REPORT YOUR TRIP TO THE AIRPORT AND THEN THE AIRLINE TRIP to the destination city (e.g. downtown Chicago to O'Hare to Denver). If you are RETURNING from outside the region, RECORD YOUR AIRLINE TRIP TO THE AIRPORT AND THEN YOUR TRIP FROM THE AIRPORT to your next destination (e.g. Denver to O'Hare to downtown Chicago).

Sometimes it is difficult to remember all of the trips that we have made during the day. The check list shows some typical travel destinations. It can be useful in determining whether you have remembered all of the trips you made on your assigned travel day.

	AIRPORT		DAY CARE		MUSEUM
<del></del>	ANTIQUE SHOP		DENTIST		NEWS STAND
<u></u>	ART GALLERY		DEPARTMENT STORE	<del></del>	NIGHT CLUB
	BABY SITTER		DOCTOR		OUT OF TOWN
<u></u>	BAKERY		DRUGGIST		PARK
	BANK		DRY CLEANERS	<u> </u>	PICK UP CHILD
	BAR/TAVERN/CLUB		FAST FOODS		PLEASURE DRIVE
	BARBER SHOP		FISHING		POST OFFICE
	BEACH		FUNERAL		RECORD STORE
	BOATING		FURNITURE STORE		RESTAURANT
	BOOK STORE		GAS STATION		SAVINGS & LOAN
<u> </u>	BOWLING ALLEY	·	GROCERY STORE		SCHOOL
	BUTCHER		HAIRDRESSER		SPORTING EVENT
	CAR DEALER		HEALTH CLUB		SUMMER COTTAGE
	CAR REPAIR		HOSPITAL	<u> </u>	TEMPLE
	CASH STATION	<del></del>	JURY DUTY		TRAIN STATION
<u>.</u>	CEMETERY		LAUNDROMAT		TRAVEL AGENT
	CHURCH		LAWYER		THEATRE
	COLLEGE		LIBRARY		VETERINARIAN
	CONCERT	<u> </u>	LIQUOR STORE	<u> </u>	VIDEO STORE
<del></del>	CONVENIENCE STORE	·	MEDICAL CLINIC	·	VISIT FAMILY
	COURT		MOVIE THEATRE		VISIT FRIEND

TRPCHLST.DOC

CITY OF CHICAGO TRAVEL SURVEY 1991 Conducted for: Illinois Department of Transportation City of Chicago

Conducted by

Chicago Area Transportation Study Survey Office: (312)793-3467 Toll Free Number: 1-800-637-9125

#### PLEASE READ THIS FIRST

- Please fill out PART 1 of the HOUSEHOLD FORM first.
- Then fill out PART 2 of the HOUSEHOLD FORM for every household member aged 14 YEARS OR OLDER.
- Then for every household member aged 14 YEARS OR OLDER fill out the TRIP FORMS for this coming THURSDAY.

### CONFIDENTIAL

The information obtained in this survey will be accorded confidential treatment, and will be used for statistical purposes only.

HOUSEHOLD FORM-PART 1 A household consists of ALL persons who live together and share the same mailing address.
How many persons (including yourself) live in this household 5 (arson(s)
Of these people, how many are less than 14 years ond? The Person(s) How many are 14 years or older? <u>4</u> Person(s)
HOW MANY of the following vehicles are owned or kept at home for use by members of this household? (Please include all vehicles usually kept at your home overnight.)
Z  AUTO(S)  MOTORCYCLE(S)    /  VAN(S) & PICKUP(S)  H    (1 Ton or Less)  BICYCLE(S)
OTHER (specify)
We may need to call you to make sure that we understand all of your answers. What is your telephone number and the first name of the person we should contact? Also, when would be a convenient time to call?
Phone Number: <u>793 - 0000</u> First Name: <u>David</u> Time: <u>5:15</u> AM PM X

Now please answer the questions on PART 2 of the HOUSEHOLD FORM for all persons aged 14 YEARS OR OLDER.

HOUSEHOLD FORM - PART 2 Please answer the following questions for all people in the household who are 14 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.								
PERSONS AGED 14	<u></u>	Oldest Person	2nd Oldest Person	3rd Oldest Person	4th Oldest Person	5th Oldest Person	6th Oldest Person	7th Oldest Person
OR OLDER	Person Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Year of Birth	1945	1947	1972	1974			
RELATIONSHIP ( (e.g. spouse, son, roo	to Oldest Person mmate, etc.)		spouse	daughter	Son			
SEX	Male Female	N N N		R	NC.			
ARE YOU CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN SCHOOL?	Yes, Full Time Yes, Part Time Not In School							
EMPLOYMENT ST (check as many boxes as Emplo	ATUS apply) byed Full Time byed Part Time Homemaker Student Unemployed Retired Dther (specify)	و الم						
CURRENT OCCUP	PATION	Truck Driver	BcoK- Keeper	Grocery Store Cashier	student			
WHAT WAS THE COMBINED HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BEFORE TAXES, FOR THE YEAR 1990? (Total for all household members listed above)								

. ·

HOUSEHOLD INCOME	Less than \$15,000	\$60,000 to \$74,999			
(1990)	\$15,000 to \$24,999	<b>\$75,000 to \$99,999</b>			
	\$25,000 to \$39,999	More than \$100,000			
Note: Reporting Income Data is Optional	<b>\$40,000 to \$59,999</b>	· · ·			
Now please complete the Trip Forms for each person listed above.					







HICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY 300 West Adams Street Chicago Illinois 60606

October, 1991

Dear Chicago Resident:

Late last month the Chicago Area Transportation Study sent you a letter stating that your household had been randomly selected to participate in a major travel survey of persons who live in the city of Chicago. By October 5, 1991 you should have received your survey materials. The survey asked for information about how you traveled on Thursday, October 10, 1991. To date, we have not received your completed questionnaire.

If you still have the survey, please fill it out using Thursday, October 17, 1991 or Thursday, October 24, 1991 as your reference travel day. If you no longer have the materials, but would like to participate, please call us and we will send you a new questionnaire.

Data from this challenging survey will provide valuable insight as to how travel patterns have changed in the city of Chicago. If you have any questions, or if you would like us to send you another questionnaire, please call Mr. Ed Christopher at 1-800-637-9125 (toll free) or 312-793-3467. If you have already mailed back your survey, please disregard this letter.

Very truly yours,

Aristide E. Biciunas Executive Director

POLICY COMMITTEE: KIRK BROWN-CHAIRMAN, Secretary, Illinois Department of Transportation DENNIS VALY-VICE CHAIRMAN, President, Village of New Lenos, Representing Council of Mayors, LAURA A. JIBBEN, Executive Director: Representing Regional Transportation Authority SHELLA A. SCHULTZ, President, Nonheasem Illinois Planning Commission DAVID S. WILLIAMS, JR., Commissioner: Department of Public Works. Representing Cuty of Chicago ROBERT L. HEDRICK, Chief Engineer, Highway Department, Representing Council JONALD G. ZEILENGA, Director, Division of Transportation, Representing Cuty of Chicago ROBERT L. HEDRICK, Chief Engineer, Highway Department, Representing County NABI R. FAKRIDDIN, Director, Division of Transportation, Representing Kaie County ROBERT DEPKE, Chairman, Lake County JAMES R. RAKOW, Superimendent of Highways, Representing Mill County ALFRED H. SAVAGE, Esacutive Director, Representing Chicago Transit Authonity MICHAEL W. PAYETTE, Vice President, Chicago & North Western Transportation Company, Representing Railcoal Companies JEFFREY R. LADD, Chairman, Commuter Rail Board (Metra) JOHN D. RITA, Chairman, South Suborban Mass Transportation, Representing Pay Authonity JAY W. MILLER, Division Administrator, Representing Bas Transportation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICHINAS-SECRET.RRY, Resource Director, Representing Illinois State Toll Highway Authonity JAY W. MILLER, Division Administrator, Representing Federal Highway Administration ARISTIDE E. BICHINAS-SECRET.RRY, Resource Director, Representing Libon Bas Transportation Administration ARISTIDE E. BICHINAS-SECRET.RRY, Resource Director, Representing Libon State Toll Highway Authonity JAY W. MILLER, Division Administrator, Representing Federal Highway Administration Administration Administration Administration Alexantation State Toll E. BICHINAS-SECRET.RRY, Executive Director, Chicago Administration Administration Administration Administration Representing Chicago Administration Administration Administration State Toll Highway Authority JAY W. MILLER, Division

#### APPENDIX B

#### Sample Size Calculation for DuPage County

#### APPENDIX B

#### Sampling Process

Survey <u>Township</u>	Group <u>Size (Households)</u>	Number of <u>Groups Per Township</u>	Number of <u>Questionnaires Mailed</u>
R09 T40	7	1,898	1,898
R10 T40	18	1,906	1,906
R11 T40	15	1,966	1,966
R09 T39	6	2,158	2,158
R10 T39	21	1,903	1,902
R11 T39	24	1,916	1,916
R09 T39	11	2,076	2,072
R11 T38	23	1,863	1,837
R11 T38 + R11 T37	28	1,932	1,931
Total		17,618	17,586

Note: Based on a 21% assumed response rate, each township sample would be drawn from 1,905 groups. The total mailout to all nine townships would then be 17,145.  $(400 = 1,905 \times 9 = 17,145)$ .21

However, due to rounding, each township sample was actually divided into slightly more or slightly less than 1,905 groups. The final edit of the 17,618 household records pulled resulted in the total number of questionnaires mailed.