## Delaware APA Monthly Lunch and Learning Series:

Delaware Population Projections, traffic modeling and demographic trends February 2022

## National Picture:

2010-2020:
Lowest \% Growth of any Decade

Figure 1: US population growth for decades: Censuses 1790 to 2020 (projected)


[^0]Source: William H Frey analysis of U.S. decennial censuses 1790-2010, and author's projection to April 1, 2020.

## National Picture:



## National Picture:

Important Dates coming in the NEXT decade:
2030 - All "baby boomers" will reach 65 (1 in 5 persons)
2030 - Net Migration will overtake natural increase as main population driver
2034-65+ population will be larger than Under 18 Population for first time ever.

COVID Impact:

- Baby Bust, not a boom (300K fewer births than expected)
- Will extend into 2021, 2022



## Local Picture:

- Delaware not immune to National trends
- Varies widely within DE
- Nat. Increase breakpoint:
NCC: 2031
Kent: 2029
Sussex: 2013
- Several intangibles at play:
- Tax structure
- Proximity to major cities
- Resort areas

Total Population - Delaware 2020-2050

| Population | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2020-2050 <br> Pop. Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DE Population | 992,035 | 1,042,869 | 1,085,592 | 1,115,712 | 123,677 |
| Total Population Growth by Decade |  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \text { to } \\ 2030 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2030 \text { to } \\ 2040 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2040 \text { to } \\ 2050 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | 50,834 | 42,723 | 30,120 |  |

Historical View

Total Population by County: 1980-2020

| 1,000,000 | $\square$ NC | - Kent | - Sussex | 197,970 | 237,390 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 156,638 |  | 181,839 |
| 600,000 |  | 113,229 |  | 162,310 |  |
|  | 98,004 | 110,993 | 126,697 |  |  |
| 400,000 | 98,219 | 441,946 | 500,265 | 538,479 | 570,719 |
|  | 398,115 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 |
| ■ Sussex | 98,004 | 113,229 | 156,638 | 197,970 | 237,390 |
| - Kent | 98,219 | 110,993 | 126,697 | 162,310 | 181,839 |
| ■ NCC | 398,115 | 441,946 | 500,265 | 538,479 | 570,719 |
| DE Total | 594,338 | 666,168 | 783,600 | 898,759 | 989,948 |

Historical View
\% Population by County: 1980-2020

| 1,000,000 | $\square$ NC | ■ Kent | - Sussex | 22\% | 24\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 20\% | 18\% | 18\% |
| 600,000 | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% |  |  |
| 400,000 | 17\% |  | 64\% | 60\% | 58\% |
| 200,000 | 67\% | 66\% |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 |
| - Sussex | 98,004 | 113,229 | 156,638 | 197,970 | 237,390 |
| - Kent | 98,219 | 110,993 | 126,697 | 162,310 | 181,839 |
| $\square$ NCC | 398,115 | 441,946 | 500,265 | 538,479 | 570,719 |
| DE Total | 594,338 | 666,168 | 783,600 | 898,759 | 989,948 |

Historical View

Total Population Growth by Decade: 1980-2020

| 120,000 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\square$ NCC ■ Kent $\square$ Sussex |
| 100,000 |  | 43,409 | 41,332 |  |
|  |  | 39,420 |  |
| 60,000 | 15,225 |  | 15,704 | 35,613 | 39,420 |
|  | 12,774 |  |  |  |
| 40,000 | 43,831 | 58,319 | 38,214 | 19,529 |
| 20,000 |  |  |  | 32,240 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1980 to 1990 | 1990 to 2000 | 2000 to 2010 | 2010 to 2020 |
| - Sussex | 15,225 | 43,409 | 41,332 | 39,420 |
| ■ Kent | 12,774 | 15,704 | 35,613 | 19,529 |
| - Total | 43,831 | 58,319 | 38,214 | 32,240 |
|  | 71,830 | 117,432 | 115,159 | 91,189 |
| \% DE Growth | 12.1\% | 17.6\% | 14.7\% | 10.1\% |
| \% Growth <br> United States | 9.8\% | 13.2\% | 9.7\% | 7.4\% |

## Transportation Analysis Zone



Progression of Demographic Projections "Pyramid"


Developed by the DPC

Planning District by the MPOs and DOT

Transportation Analysis Zone


# Key Pieces of the DPC methodology 

- Current Population Structure
- Age/Race/Gender distribution and trends - Life expectancy/Mortality rates for each single age cohort
- Fertility Rates for each group
- Migration/Labor Force
- Multiple Sources (i.e. BLS, LAUS, etc...)
- Highly economically dependent
- Multiple variables (workforce participation, disabilities, etc.)


Delaware Population Forecast by County

| $\begin{aligned} & 1,200,000 \\ & 1,000,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ NCC | ■ Kent | - Sussex | 27\% | 28\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 24\% | 26\% |  |  |
|  | 22\% |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% |
| 600,000 | 18\% |  |  |  |  |
| 400,000 | 60\% | 58\% | 56\% | 55\% | 54\% |
| 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| - Sussex | 197,970 | 238,496 | 272,266 | 295,311 | 307,544 |
| $\square$ Kent | 162,310 | 182,481 | 184,613 | 190,631 | 204,411 |
| - NCC | 538,479 | 571,058 | 585,990 | 599,650 | 603,757 |
| \% Growth by Decade |  | 10.4\% | 5.1\% | 4.1\% | 2.8\% |

Population Changes by age: Delaware Counties

| New Castle | 2020 | 2050 | Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to 4 | 32,424 | 29,391 | -3,033 | -9\% |
| 5 to 17 | 106,211 | 96,323 | -9,888 | -9\% |
| 18 to 29 | 119,563 | 103,912 | -15,651 | -13\% |
| 30 to 64 | 222,106 | 234,356 | 12,250 | 6\% |
| 65+ | 90,754 | 139,775 | 49,021 | 54\% |
|  | 571,058 | 603,757 |  |  |


| Kent | 2020 | 2050 | $\begin{aligned} & 2020-2050 \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | 2020-2050 \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to 4 | 11,028 | 11,476 | 448 | 4\% |
| 5 to 19 | 36,539 | 36,300 | -239 | -1\% |
| 20 to 34 | 38,881 | 36,784 | -2,097 | -5\% |
| 35 to 64 | 66,032 | 79,567 | 13,535 | 20\% |
| 65+ | 30,001 | 40,284 | 10,283 | 34\% |
|  | 182,481 | 204,411 |  |  |


| Sussex | 2020 | 2050 | $\begin{gathered} 2020-2050 \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2020-2050 \\ & \% \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to 4 | 11,734 | 14,302 | 2,568 | 22\% |
| 5 to 19 | 38,393 | 45,524 | 7,131 | 19\% |
| 20 to 34 | 36,637 | 44,573 | 7,936 | 22\% |
| 35 to 64 | 88,665 | 110,099 | 21,434 | 24\% |
| 65+ | 63,067 | 93,046 | 29,979 | 48\% |
|  | 238,496 | 307,544 |  |  |

## Other DPC Products: Seasonal Projections

- Estimates on Summer Population and Employment Totals
- Projections for all municipalities

Employment by Month, Salisbury MD/DE BEA



## Local Picture:

## Several Internal Changes Happening

 Impacting Housing/Population:- Household types changing in parts of the County - Renter vs. Owner
- Growth in the "non-family household" and single person households
- Aging population and other choices continue to shape household types, creating a potential housing "bubble"
- Changes in type of vacancies



## Local Picture:

## Under 18 Population

|  | 2000 <br> Census |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | ACS 2017 | Change <br> $2000-2017$ |  |
| Brandywine | 18,074 | 18,037 | -37 |
| Glasgow | 9,517 | 9,465 | -52 |
| Greater Newark | 13,230 | 11,172 | $-2,058$ |
| L. Christiana | 8,840 | 8,091 | $\mathbf{- 7 4 9}$ |
| MOT | 8,390 | 15,314 | $\mathbf{6 , 9 2 4}$ |
| New Castle | 22,634 | 20,082 | $\mathbf{- 2 , 5 5 2}$ |
| Piedmont | 7,598 | 5,766 | $-1,832$ |
| Pike Creek | 9,656 | 8,701 | -955 |
| Red Lion | 1,571 | 2,232 | $\mathbf{6 6 1}$ |
| U.Christiana | 6,282 | 5,755 | -527 |
| Wilmington | 18,687 | 16,034 | $-2,653$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 2 4 , 4 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 , 6 4 9}$ | $-3,830$ |


| New Castle County | $\begin{aligned} & 2000 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | ACS 2017 | Change 2000-2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 13,554 | 15,868 | 2,314 |
| Glasgow | 1,398 | 4,730 | 3,332 |
| Greater Newark | 6,217 | 9,968 | 3,751 |
| L. Christiana | 5,832 | 5,106 | -726 |
| MOT | 2,076 | 9,043 | 6,967 |
| New Castle | 7,246 | 11,195 | 3,949 |
| Piedmont | 4,390 | 7,624 | 3,234 |
| Pike Creek | 6,135 | 7,120 | 985 |
| Red Lion | 439 | 1,354 | 915 |
| U.Christiana | 1,500 | 3,118 | 1,618 |
| Wilmington | 9,177 | 9,142 | -35 |
| TOTAL | 57,964 | 84,268 | 26,304 |



While total household growing, Household sizes shrinking

- Changes in Renter vs. Owner Housing

Between 2000 and 2017:

- NCC added a net of 7,233 OWNER-occupied HHs. Avg. HH size 2.73
- NCC added a net of 9,661 RENTER-occupied HHs. Avg. HH Size 2.41

OWNER-occupied

| New Castle <br> County | Owner <br> Occupied HH <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Owner <br> Occupied HH <br> ACS 2017 | 2000-2017 <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 23,712 | 23,015 | -697 |
| Glasgow | 9,245 | 11,072 | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 7}$ |
| Greater Newark | 14,525 | 14,647 | $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ |
| L. Christiana | 10,407 | 9,536 | -871 |
| MOT | 8,478 | 17,664 | $\mathbf{9 , 1 8 6}$ |
| New Castle | 21,292 | 20,869 | -423 |
| Piedmont | 9,236 | 9,397 | $\mathbf{1 6 1}$ |
| Pike Creek | 13,794 | 12,328 | $-1,466$ |
| Red Lion | 1,723 | 2,942 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 1 9}$ |
| U.Christiana | 5,770 | 5,789 | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |
| Wilmington | 14,332 | 12,488 | $\mathbf{- 1 , 8 4 4}$ |
| $r$ Totals | $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 5 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 9 , 7 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 2 3 3}$ |

RENTER-occupied

| New Castle <br> County | Renter <br> Occupied HH <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Renter <br> Occupied HH <br> Acs 2017 | 2000 - 2017 <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 8,580 | 8,775 | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ |
| Glasgow | 2,071 | 3,494 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 2 3}$ |
| Greater Newark | 8,626 | 9,707 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 8 1}$ |
| L. Christiana | 4,089 | 4,256 | $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ |
| MOT | 1,071 | 2,237 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 6 6}$ |
| New Castle | 9,017 | 11,049 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 3 2}$ |
| Piedmont | 1,418 | 1,762 | $\mathbf{3 4 4}$ |
| Pike Creek | 3,379 | 4,115 | $\mathbf{7 3 6}$ |
| Red Lion | 183 | 231 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ |
| U.Christiana | 3,702 | 4,138 | $\mathbf{4 3 6}$ |
| Wilmington | 14,285 | 16,318 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 3 3}$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{5 6 , 4 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 0 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 6 1}$ |

While total household growing, Household sizes shrinking

- Growth in the "non-family household"

Between 2000 and 2017:

- NCC added a net of 5,106 Family HHs Avg. Family HH size 3.26
- NCC added a net of 11,786 Non-Family HHs. Avg. Non-Family size 1.29

Family HHs

| New Castle <br> County | Family HHs <br> Census 2000 | Family HHs <br> ACS 2017 | Change <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 21,947 | 20,390 | $\mathbf{- 1 , 5 5 7}$ |
| Glasgow | 8,680 | 10,477 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 9 7}$ |
| Greater Newark | 14,437 | 13,824 | -613 |
| L. Christiana | 9,630 | 8,626 | $\mathbf{- 1 , 0 0 4}$ |
| MOT | 7,825 | 15,875 | $\mathbf{8 , 0 5 0}$ |
| New Castle | 21,028 | 20,642 | $\mathbf{- 3 8 6}$ |
| Piedmont | 8,564 | 8,676 | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ |
| Pike Creek | 11,401 | 10,520 | $\mathbf{- 8 8 1}$ |
| Red Lion | 1,484 | 2,348 | $\mathbf{8 6 4}$ |
| U.Christiana | 6,229 | 6,636 | $\mathbf{4 0 7}$ |
| Wilmington | 15,881 | 14,198 | $\mathbf{- 1 , 6 8 3}$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{1 2 7 , 1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 2 1 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{y y y y}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 0 6}$ |  |  |

Non-Family HHs

| New Castle <br> County | Non Family <br> HHs 2000 | Non-Family HHs <br> ACS 2017 | Change <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 10,345 | 11,400 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 5 5}$ |
| Glasgow | 2,636 | 4,089 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 5 3}$ |
| Greater Newark | 8,714 | 10,530 | $\mathbf{1 , 8 1 6}$ |
| L. Christiana | 4,866 | 5,166 | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ |
| MOT | 1,724 | 4,026 | $\mathbf{2 , 3 0 2}$ |
| New Castle | 9,281 | 11,276 | $\mathbf{1 , 9 9 5}$ |
| Piedmont | 2,090 | 2,481 | $\mathbf{3 9 1}$ |
| Pike Creek | 5,772 | 5,923 | $\mathbf{1 5 1}$ |
| Red Lion | 422 | 825 | $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ |
| U.Christiana | 3,243 | 3,291 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ |
| Wilmington | 12,736 | 14,608 | $\mathbf{1 , 8 7 2}$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{6 1 , 8 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 , 6 1 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 , 7 8 6}$ |  |  |  |

Since 2000: Non-family HHs households but are $71 \%$ of the HH growth type; $26 \%$ of new population

## 65+ Single Person HHs

\% of Total Households
2000: 8.0\%
2016 10.4\%


Changes in Age 65+ Single Person HHs: 2000-2017


| New Castle <br> County | 65 +Single <br> Person HHs <br> Census 2000 | 65 +Single <br> Person HHs <br> ACS 2017 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 7}$ <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brandywine | 3,516 | 4,214 | $\mathbf{6 9 8}$ |
| Glasgow | 265 | 1,067 | $\mathbf{8 0 2}$ |
| Greater Newark | 1,652 | 2,588 | 936 |
| L. Christiana | 1,715 | 1,501 | $\mathbf{- 2 1 4}$ |
| MOT | 457 | 1,274 | $\mathbf{8 1 7}$ |
| New Castle | 1,942 | 3,099 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 7}$ |
| Piedmont | 982 | 1,235 | $\mathbf{2 5 3}$ |
| Pike Creek | 1,474 | 1,856 | $\mathbf{3 8 2}$ |
| Red Lion | 90 | 266 | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ |
| U.Christiana | 322 | 653 | $\mathbf{3 3 1}$ |
| Wilmington | 3,723 | 3,670 | $\mathbf{- 5 3}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 , 1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 4 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 2 8 5}$ |

## Some Elements "In the Model":

## A "Travel Demand Model" is an Opportunity / Cost Model:

-- Market Based, Data-Driven

| Land Use |
| :---: |
| Where You Need to Go ... |
| Where You Want to Go... |
| Number of Opportunities |
| "Proximities" |

Transportation
How You Get There . .
How You Want to Get There ...

Time / Distance
"Accessibilities"

Examples:

Number of:
Stores
Parks
Homes
Jobs
within:
10 minute WALK.
30 minute BIKE
20 minute BUS of Store. 30 minute DRIVE of Home.

## Types of Land Use-Transportation Studies in Delaware (by DeIDOT, MPO's, Other Agencies)
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## Model Applications:

Regional Planning:
MPO long range plans
MPO TIP's
Truck/Freight Planning
Congestion Management System Land Use Scenarios

Statewide Planning:
Statewide Plan Scenarios
Delaware STIP
Evacuation Planning
Studies:
Toll Revenue
Bus \& Rail Transit
EIS/MIS
Corridor \& Subarea Studies
Community Plans
Traffic Data for Synchro/VISSIM

## Model Applications (cont.)

Development Coordination:
TIS Site Trip Distributions
Background Traffic Estimates
"Shift" or Diverted Traffic
Design Year Forecasts:
Title Box Existing AADT
Title Box Forecast AADT
Design Year K, D, \% Trucks
Upstream Population Density
Air Quality:
SIP Emissions for Air Agency
Conformity Emissions
CMAQ Analysis
AQ Strategic Planning


$\square$
$\rightarrow$



























 | Typical Study Area: | Parcels/Sites |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Examples: | TIS/TID |  |
| Typical Projects: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Intersections } \\ \text { Bypass Lanes } \\ \text { Shoulder } \\ \text { Upgrades }\end{array}$ | $\square$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { DeIDOT Travel } \\ \text { Demand Model } \\ \text { Level (TAZ Type) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Level } 3 \\ \text { Parcels }\end{array}$ |

MAO TAX
 ,

-




## Evaluation of "Land Use Proximities" via Accessibility Scenarios

Recall: Land Uses (Number of Population, Housing, Employment) are "Opportunities" Proximities are Functions of Transportation Accessibilities

"Before SR 1"

"After SR 1"


## AUTO Volumes (AADT)

 <br> \section*{\section*{ <br> \section*{\section*{


年年年年年年年年 <br> <br>  <br> <br>  <br> <br> \begin{tabular}{ll}
<br>
\hline

 <br> <br> 

<br>
\hline
\end{tabular} <br> <br> 五 <br> <br> 五 <br> <br> （a 2} <br> <br> （a 2}



## Delaware Department of Transportation Division of Planning

Background on Travel Demand Modeling


## MODEL FUNCTIONS Required Use Common Use for Delaware DOT Other"

## Model Maintenance:

1 Update Network \& Land Use Files
Update Traffic Count Files
Update Core Model Equations
2 Model Applications:
Regional Planning:
MPO long range plans
MPO TIP's
Truck/Freight Planning
Congestion Management System
Land Use Scenarios
Statewide Planning:
Statewide Plan Scenarios
Delaware STIP
Evacuation Planning

## Studies:

Toll Revenue
Bus \& Rail Transit
EIS/MIS
Corridor \& Subarea Studies
Community Plans
Traffic Data for Synchro/VISSIM

## Model Applications (cont.)

Development Coordination
TIS Site Trip Distributions Background Traffic Estimates "Shift" or Diverted Traffic

## Design Year Forecasts:

Title Box Existing AADT
Title Box Forecast AADT
Design Year K, D, \% Trucks
Upstream Population Density

## Air Quality:

SIP Emissions for Air Agency Conformity Emissions CMAQ Analysis
AQ Strategic Planning
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## Model Development:

Model Improvements
Expand Core Model
Expand Feature Models
New Reporting \& Summaries
GIS Integration


## Level 1

Level 1 model runs (TAZ):
Benefits:
-Quickest run time
-Quickest set-up
-Quickest calibration
-Whole state can be run at L1 resolution (2136 zones)

## Potential problems:

-Resolution not high enough to include all roadways in question
-Centroid connections may need adjustments -Traffic assignment perhaps questionable due to lack of other higher resolution roadways in study area


Level 1 inputs

| TAZ_field | Definition | Source/Notes | Purpose | Sample data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WRK_HH_15 | Avg. Workers per HH Year 2015 | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 1.14 |
| TOT_WRK_15 | Total Workers year 2015 |  |  |  |
| INC_15 | median HH income | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 47,054 |
| VEH_HH_15 | Avg. Vehicles per HH year 2015 | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 1.74 |
| TOT_VEH_15 | Total Vehicles |  |  |  |
| HH_2015 | Occupied HHs 2015 | WILMAPCO Data/Demo Subcommittee |  | 1,050 |
| POP_2015 | Total Population 2015 | WILMAPCO Data/Demo Subcommittee |  | 3,057 |
| EMP_2010 | Total Employment 2010 | WILMAPCO, Dover/Kent MPO |  | 2,098 |
| EMP_2015 | Total Employment 2015 | WILMAPCO Data/Demo Subcommittee |  | 2,303 |
| NATRES_15 | Natural Resources \& Mining | 11, 21 NAICS Supersectors | These fields break down the total employment into jobs by type. Each of these have their own trip generation rates, with Retail \& Leisure/Hospitality being higher generators | 0 |
| CONS_15 | Construction | 22 NAICS Supersector |  | 64 |
| MANU_15 | Manufacturing | 31-33 NAICS Supersectors |  | 118 |
| WHL_RET_15 | Wholesale \& Retail Trade | 42,44-45 NAICS Supersectors |  | 382 |
| TRN_UTL_15 | Transportation \& Utilities | 22,48-49 NAICS Supersectors |  | 100 |
| INFO_15 | Information | 51 NAICS Supersector |  | 16 |
| FINANCE_15 | Finance, Insurance and Real Estate | 52-53 NAICS Supersectors |  | 547 |
| PRO_BUS_15 | Professional and Business Services | 54-56 NAICS Supersectors |  | 273 |
| ED_HEALT_15 | Health and Education | 61-62 NAICS Supersectors |  | 325 |
| LE_HOSP_15 | Leisure \& Hospitality | 71-72 NAICS Supersectors |  | 354 |
| OT_SVCS_15 | Other Services | 81 NAICS Supersector |  | 55 |
| PUBADM_15 | Public Administration | 91-93 NAICS Supersectors |  | 69 |
| GQ_POP_10 | Group Quarter population | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) | Population in prisons removed from total population. They do not generate trips. | 157 |
| GQ_TYP_10 | Group Quarter Type (prison, senior, student, etc...) | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  |  |
| Over65pct_15 | \% of population over 65 | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) | Helps in allocating household trip generation rates as 65+ have different travel patterns | 14\% |
| Zero_HH_pct15 | \% of zero car households | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 5\% |
| SOV_15 | \% of single occupant vehicles from JTW data | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) | Used to assign trips by mode. Data is only for Journey to Work trips (JTW) | 68\% |
| Pool_15 | \% of carpoolers from JTW data | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 5\% |
| Trans_15 | \% of public transit vehicles from JTW data | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 7\% |
| WLK_BK_15 | \% of walkers/bikers from JTW data | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 18\% |
| Home_15 | \% of home workers from JTW data | from 2012-16 American Community Survey (ACS) |  | 3\% |

## Level 2

Level 2 model runs (Census Block):
Benefits:
-Comparable run time to L1
-Network resolution is essentially L3
-Whole state able to be run at L2 resolution (24000 zones)

## Potential Problems:

-Extended time in set-up via GIS tool
-Extended time in calibration
-Extended time in network check (inclusion of new projects, etc)


## Level 3

Level 3 model runs (Tax Parcel):
Benefits:
-Centroid loading is per parcel
-Very accurate loading for use with turning movements, bike/ped, etc. after calibration
-All projects at the microscopic level can be analyzed

## Potential Problems:

-All L2 problems
-Whole state cannot run at L3 resolution
-Network building and uses need to be reduced in order to save run-time


- Reviewed Annually
- Constant eye on land use activity
- Rely on county land use agencies
- TREND analysis. Scenarios part of RTP process if needed
- Use most recent employment type trends



## Use of Census/ACS Data CUBE Model "Main Page"




## Use of Census/ACS Data Zonal Data into Household Data

Data Items List:
; Persons per Household
; Vehicles per Household
; Workers per Household
; Income quartile factors
; Calculate two-way cross classification tables for trip generation rates,by seven trip purposes:
(workers per household by persons per household)
(persons per household by vehicles per household)


[^0]:    *Projected

