## INTRODUCTION

During the years 2011 and 2012, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) conducted an inventory of travel for the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region. Historically, a large-scale travel inventory has been conducted approximately once every 10 years in conjunction with the U.S. Census and land use and transportation system inventories conducted as part of a major review and update of the Commission's land use and transportation plan. Similar travel inventories were previously conducted in 1963, 1972, 1991, and 2001. This travel inventory consisted of five major elements-a resident household travel survey, a group-quartered travel survey, a public transit travel survey, a truck travel survey, and an external travel survey. The following sections of this appendix describe the travel inventory and accuracy checks of the expanded data.

## THE 2011 REGIONAL INVENTORY OF TRAVEL: MAJOR ELEMENTS

The 2011 survey of resident households was based on a sample of 15,400 households, or approximately 2 percent of the estimated total of 800,100 households in the Region. This large scale sample provides a rich set of data, permitting the description and analysis of resident household travel both by subarea and between subareas of the Region. Information obtained from each sampled household included detailed data concerning specific household characteristics, including the number of household members, number of vehicles available, structure type of residence, and household income range; specific data for each household member, such as relationship to head of household, age, license-to-drive status, race/ethnicity, gender, and employment status; and, for each trip made by people over the age of five on the assigned travel day, the origin and destination of trip, trip purpose, time of day, mode of travel, and, for drivers of personal vehicles-automobiles, vans, sport utility vehicles, or pickup trucks-the number of passengers in the vehicle, parking location, type of parking, and cost of parking.

In addition, 900 samples, representing approximately 2 percent of the 45,400 residents of the Region living in group quarters, such as Huber jail facilities, shelters, and schools and other institutions, were surveyed. The sample was drawn from a list of such facilities compiled by the Commission using telephone directories and consultations with various agencies of government. Group quartered residents who were severely restricted in their ability to travel were not surveyed. This group included residents of mental health facilities, prisons, and nursing homes.

The five major public transit systems operating in the Region in 2011 were also surveyed. Each of the five systems was sampled at rates designed to permit analysis of the characteristics of existing transit system ridership. For

the Kenosha area transit system, 390 samples were obtained, an 11 percent sample of its estimated 3,600 average weekday boarding passengers. For the Milwaukee area transit system, 6,400 samples were obtained, representing a 4 percent sample of its estimated 157,500 average weekday boarding passengers. For the Racine area transit system, 290 samples were obtained, representing a 6 percent sample of its estimated 4,600 average weekday boarding passengers. For the City of Waukesha transit system, 180 samples were obtained, representing a 7 percent sample of its estimated 2,600 average weekday boarding passengers. For the Waukesha County transit system, 210 samples were obtained, representing a 31 percent sample of its estimated 670 average weekday boarding passengers. Information obtained through mail-back survey forms included detailed data concerning specific household characteristics, including the location of each tripmaker's home, number of household members, number of vehicles available, and household income range; specific data regarding each tripmaker, such as age, sex, license-to-drive status, and race/ethnicity; and for each trip, the origin and destination of the trip, trip purpose, time of day, transfer information, mode of travel to the bus stop, fares, round-trip frequency, and length of time using transit.

The 2011 regional travel inventory also included a commercial truck survey. The truck survey was intended to provide information regarding the movement of freight and the delivery of services within the Region by commercial trucks registered and garaged within the Region. The survey of commercial truck travel was based on a sample of about 640 commercial trucks, or approximately 0.5 percent of the estimated 121,600 commercial trucks registered in the Region. Information obtained through a mail-back survey for each sampled truck included detailed data concerning the business or industry of the truck owner; the truck garaging location, carrier type, odometer reading at the beginning and end of the travel day, and vehicle type; and for each trip made using the truck on the assigned travel survey day, the origin and destination of the trip, trip purpose, and time of day.

The 2011 survey also included an external cordon survey of interregional vehicle traffic. Interregional or external travel is travel where one or both ends of the trip are located outside of Southeastern Wisconsin. In the external cordon survey, roadside interview stations were established on 38 major streets and highways crossing the boundaries of the Region. At these stations, mail-back survey forms were distributed to 161,900 motorists crossing these stations during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the spring of 2011 and spring of 2012. Approximately 20,100 usable survey forms were returned, representing more than 6 percent of the 363,800 regional boundary crossings by vehicles estimated to occur at the interview stations during an average weekday. Information obtained through the mail-back survey included: the vehicle used in making the trip, the garaging address of the vehicle, type of vehicle, and number of passengers carried; and, for trucks, the carrier type. For trips crossing the cordon line, data regarding the origin, destination, and purpose of each trip were also obtained.

The external cordon survey also included a survey of interregional personal travel by other modes to provide information regarding the movement of individuals not using a personal vehicle to enter or exit the Region. The 2011 interregional travel survey captured travel by airplane, intercity rail, intercity bus, and the Lake Express Ferry. The survey of airport travel sampled approximately 1,100 deplaning weekday passengers at General Mitchell International Airport from Tuesday, September 27, through Thursday, September 29, 2011, for 12 hours each day (7:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. on

Tuesday, 9:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 11:00 a.m. - 11:00 p.m. on Thursday). This sample represents approximately 6 percent of the estimated 18,800 average weekday passengers utilizing the Airport in 2011. The intercity rail survey, which was conducted on September 13 and 22, 2011, captured travel on Amtrak and Metra intercity rail services operating within the Region. The sample of 150 boarding Amtrak passengers and 80 boarding Metra passengers represents an approximately 8 percent sample of the estimated 2,800 average weekday intercity rail passengers in 2011. The survey of intercity bus travel, which was conducted on September 14, 15, 20, and 22, 2011, captured travel on routes operated by Greyhound, Megabus, Badger Bus, Coach USA, Lamers, Indian Trails, and Jefferson Bus Lines. The sample of 170 boarding intercity bus passengers represents an approximately 11 percent sample of the estimated 1,600 average weekday intercity bus passengers in 2011. The survey of the Lake Express Ferry, which was conducted on September 15, 2011, elicited a sample of 100 boarding passengers representing approximately 33 percent of the estimated 300 average weekday passengers. Information on interregional travel was obtained through a handout/mail-back survey for each individual boarding the Amtrak, Metra, interregional bus, and the Lake Express Ferry, and approximately 20 percent of the deplaning passengers exiting a concourse at General Mitchell International Airport. The interregional travel surveys included detailed data concerning origin, destination, and purpose of each trip; information about transport to and from the terminal end of the interregional mode surveyed; and the gender, age, and household income of the individual completing the survey.

The expanded data obtained in these surveys and estimates provided a representation of the total travel occurring within the Region on an average weekday in 2011. In each survey, careful attention was given to data collection scheduling to prevent any day-related or seasonal bias in the information. Travel surveys are usually conducted by the Commission in either the spring (March through May), or in the fall (September through November), in order to obtain travel data representative of average weekday conditions. Traffic volume counts collected by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) in Southeastern Wisconsin indicate that traffic volumes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays most closely approximate average weekday traffic volumes, while those on Fridays are slightly higher, and on Mondays are slightly lower, than the average weekday (see Figure C.1). Traffic volumes on Saturdays and Sundays are substantially lower than the average weekday. With respect to monthly variations, traffic volumes in the spring and the fall generally approximate average weekday traffic volumes (see Figure C.2). Traffic volumes in the summer months of June, July, and August are generally higher than average, and traffic volumes in the winter months of January and February are lower than average.

Two distinct sets of accuracy checks were employed to determine the degree of accuracy and completeness of data obtained in the major travel surveys. In one set, data on socioeconomic characteristics obtained from the major surveys were compared with data from the 2010 Census, 2006-2010 Federal Census American Community Survey (ACS), and other independent sources. In the other set of accuracy checks, vehicle trip volumes derived from travel surveys were compared to vehicle trip volumes obtained by classification

Figure C. 1
Comparison of the Ratio of Daily Traffic Volumes to
Average Weekday Traffic Volumes by Day of Week: 2011


Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC

Figure C. 2
Comparison of the Ratio of Average Monthly Weekday Traffic Volumes to Average Weekday Traffic Volumes by Month of Year: 2011


Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC
counts made at screenlines and cordon lines. ${ }^{54}$ The level of vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) derived from travel surveys was also compared to actual VMT estimated from traffic counts. The following sections document the results of accuracy checks.

## SOCIOECONOMIC ACCURACY CHECKS

The socioeconomic data from the 2011 household travel survey was compared to data from the 2010 Census, Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP), ACS, and other sources. The data comparisons included the distribution of households by household size, vehicles available, income, and lifestyle; ${ }^{55}$ the distribution of population by age, gender, and employment status; and estimated total regional personal vehicle and commercial truck availability.

The percentage distribution of households by household size, as established by the survey, was essentially the same as that identified by the 2010 Census at county and regional levels. Table C. 1 provides a comparison of the distribution of households by household size within each county as measured by the 2010 Census and as derived from the year 2011 resident household survey. The county-level survey data on household size are within 0.2 percent of corresponding 2010 Census data in almost all categories. At the regional level, the Census and survey data were essentially the same.

The next socioeconomic accuracy check compared vehicle availability as measured by the 2006-2010 CTPP and SEWRPC estimates based on 2011 WisDOT vehicle registration data, to vehicle availability as estimated by the 2011 resident household survey. Table C. 2 compares estimates of the total number of vehicles available to households in the Region from the travel survey to those of the 2006-2010 CTPP and WisDOT vehicle registrations. The total distribution of vehicles available was accurately estimated by the survey, varying from 2006-2010 CTPP estimates by no more than 0.5 percent at the regional and county levels. As compared to 2011 estimates based on WisDOT vehicle registration data, the vehicle availability estimates from the survey were within 7.3 percent at the county level and within 0.5 percent for the Region.

Table C. 3 compares the distribution of households by vehicles available, and indicates that the distribution of households by vehicle availability is accurately estimated by the travel survey as compared to the 2006-2010 CTPP. The county-level survey data on vehicle availability are within 1.0 percent of the corresponding 2006-2010 CTPP data in almost all categories.

The distribution of annual household income estimated from the travel survey was also compared with similar data estimated from the 2006-2010 CTPP as shown in Table C.4. The estimated household income based upon

[^0]Table C. 1
Comparison of the Estimated Distribution of Households by Household Size in the Region

|  | Household Size | 2010 Federal Census |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference in Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of Households | Percent Distribution | Number of Households | Percent Distribution |  |
|  | One Person | 16,388 | 26.2 | 16,427 | 26.2 | -- |
|  | Two People | 19,968 | 31.9 | 19,978 | 31.9 | -- |
|  | Three People | 10,484 | 16.7 | 10,509 | 16.7 | -- |
|  | Four People | 9,088 | 14.5 | 9,110 | 14.5 | -- |
|  | Five or More People | 6,722 | 10.7 | 6,738 | 10.7 | -- |
|  | Total | 62,650 | 100.0 | 62,762 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | One Person | 129,317 | 33.7 | 129,573 | 33.7 | -- |
|  | Two People | 116,827 | 30.5 | 117,073 | 30.5 | -- |
|  | Three People | 57,206 | 14.9 | 57,327 | 14.9 | -- |
|  | Four People | 42,925 | 11.2 | 43,015 | 11.2 | -- |
|  | Five or More People | 37,316 | 9.7 | 37,395 | 9.7 | -- |
|  | Total | 383,591 | 100.0 | 384,383 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | One Person | 8,475 | 24.8 | 8,509 | 24.7 | -0.1 |
|  | Two People | 12,791 | 37.4 | 12,864 | 37.4 | -- |
|  | Three People | 5,321 | 15.5 | 5,359 | 15.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Four People | 4,802 | 14.0 | 4,812 | 14.0 | -- |
|  | Five or More People | 2,839 | 8.3 | 2,845 | 8.3 | -- |
|  | Total | 34,228 | 100.0 | 34,389 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | One Person | 19,958 | 26.4 | 19,997 | 26.4 | -- |
|  | Two People | 26,130 | 34.5 | 26,213 | 34.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Three People | 11,955 | 15.8 | 11,979 | 15.8 | -- |
|  | Four People | 10,185 | 13.5 | 10,205 | 13.4 | -0.1 |
|  | Five or More People | 7,423 | 9.8 | 7,438 | 9.8 | -- |
|  | Total | 75,651 | 100.0 | 75,832 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{2}{3} \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | One Person | 10,554 | 26.6 | 10,581 | 26.6 | -- |
|  | Two People | 14,008 | 35.3 | 14,044 | 35.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Three People | 6,068 | 15.3 | 6,083 | 15.3 | -- |
|  | Four People | 5,090 | 12.8 | 5,018 | 12.6 | -0.2 |
|  | Five or More People | 3,979 | 10.0 | 3,989 | 10.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 39,699 | 100.0 | 39,715 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | One Person | 11,839 | 22.9 | 11,908 | 23.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Two People | 19,195 | 37.2 | 19,222 | 37.1 | -0.1 |
|  | Three People | 8,336 | 16.2 | 8,341 | 16.1 | -0.1 |
|  | Four People | 7,719 | 15.0 | 7,748 | 15.0 | -- |
|  | Five or More People | 4,516 | 8.7 | 4,533 | 8.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 51,605 | 100.0 | 51,752 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{y} \\ & \underset{j}{j} \\ & \frac{1}{J} \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | One Person | 36,286 | 23.8 | 36,366 | 23.7 | -0.1 |
|  | Two People | 56,297 | 36.9 | 56,464 | 36.9 | -- |
|  | Three People | 24,083 | 15.8 | 24,152 | 15.8 | -- |
|  | Four People | 22,846 | 14.9 | 22,996 | 15.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Five or More People | 13,151 | 8.6 | 13,189 | 8.6 | -- |
|  | Total | 152,663 | 100.0 | 153,167 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { co } \\ & \hline \mathbf{O} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | One Person | 232,817 | 29.1 | 233,361 | 29.1 | -- |
|  | Two People | 265,216 | 33.2 | 265,858 | 33.2 | -- |
|  | Three People | 123,453 | 15.4 | 123,750 | 15.4 | -- |
|  | Four People | 102,655 | 12.8 | 102,904 | 12.8 | -- |
|  | Five or More People | 75,946 | 9.5 | 76,127 | 9.5 | -- |
|  | Total | 800,087 | 100.0 | 802,000 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

Table C. 2
Comparison of the Estimated Number of Vehicles Available in the Region

| County | 2006-2010 CTPP |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Vehicles | Percent of Total | Number of Vehicles | Percent of Total | Number | Percent |
| Kenosha | 114,600 | 8.5 | 118,456 | 8.6 | 3,856 | 0.1 |
| Milwaukee | 553,250 | 40.8 | 556,404 | 40.6 | 3,154 | -0.2 |
| Ozaukee | 66,765 | 4.9 | 69,221 | 5.0 | 2,456 | 0.1 |
| Racine | 135,560 | 10.0 | 140,145 | 10.2 | 4,585 | 0.2 |
| Walworth | 77,300 | 5.7 | 78,072 | 5.7 | 772 | -- |
| Washington | 104,245 | 7.7 | 109,253 | 8.0 | 5,008 | 0.3 |
| Waukesha | 303,585 | 22.4 | 300,359 | 21.9 | -3,226 | -0.5 |
| Region | 1,355,305 | 100.0 | 1,371,910 | 100.0 | 16,605 | -- |
|  | 2011 Estimate Based on Vehicle Registrations |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference |  |
| County | Number of Vehicles | Percent of Total | Number of Vehicles | Percent of Total | Number | Percent |
| Kenosha | 120,050 | 8.7 | 118,456 | 8.6 | -1,594 | -1.3 |
| Milwaukee | $544,540$ | $39.5$ | $556,404$ | 40.6 | 11,864 | 2.2 |
| Ozaukee | 70,280 | 5.1 | 69,221 | 5.0 | -1,059 | -1.5 |
| Racine | 146,840 | 10.7 | 140,145 | 10.2 | -6,695 | -4.6 |
| Walworth | 84,230 | 6.1 | 78,072 | 5.7 | -6,158 | -7.3 |
| Washington | 105,420 | 7.6 | 109,253 | 8.0 | 3,833 | 3.6 |
| Waukesha | 307,310 | 22.3 | 300,359 | 21.9 | -6,951 | -2.3 |
| Region | 1,378,670 | 100.0 | 1,371,910 | 100.0 | -6,760 | -0.5 |

Source: 2006-2010 Census Transportation Planning Package, WisDOT, and SEWRPC
the travel survey data by county varied by 0.1 to 26.6 percent from CTPP derived distributions, and at the regional level, the percentage of households in any given income range based on the 2011 resident household survey did not differ from the corresponding percentage of households based on CTPP data by more or less than 12.4 percent. Given that only 59 percent of the households provided income data and that the two datasets both represent sampled data, the variation in the travel survey distribution as compared with the CTPP is not unexpected.

The distribution of households based on household lifestyle from the travel survey was compared to the distribution obtained from the 2010 Census and is set forth in Table C.5. As shown in Table C.5, the comparison indicates that the distribution of households was accurately estimated by the 2011 resident household survey, varying from the 2010 Census by 0.0 to 4.7 percent at the county level, and 1.1 to 2.5 percent for the Region.

Table C. 6 provides comparisons of data on the distribution of regional population by age category from the 2010 Census data and from the 2011 household travel survey. This comparison indicates that the distribution of population by age category was accurately estimated by the survey, with a difference no greater or less than 1.2 percent from Census estimates.

Table C. 7 provides comparisons of data on the distribution of regional and county population by gender from the 2010 Census data and from the 2011 household travel survey. The comparison indicates that the distribution of population by gender by county was accurately estimated by the survey, with a difference no greater or less than 0.8 percent from 2010 Census estimates. Figure C. 3 compares the composition of regional population by age and gender. This comparison indicates that the distribution of population by age and gender is accurately estimated by the 2011 resident household survey.

Table C. 3
Comparison of the Distribution of Households by Vehicle Availability in the Region

|  | Vehicle Availability | 2006-2010 CTPP |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference in Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of Households | Percent Distribution | Number of Households | Percent Distribution |  |
|  | No Vehicles | 4,285 | 6.7 | 3,828 | 6.1 | -0.6 |
|  | One Vehicle | 21,109 | 33.2 | 19,943 | 31.8 | -1.4 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 25,807 | 40.6 | 26,179 | 41.7 | 1.1 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 8,170 | 12.9 | 8,428 | 13.4 | 0.5 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 4,194 | 6.6 | 4,384 | 7.0 | 0.4 |
|  | Total | 63,565 | 100.0 | 62,762 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | No Vehicles | 51,500 | 13.6 | 51,052 | 13.3 | -0.3 |
|  | One Vehicle | 164,488 | 43.4 | 163,493 | 42.5 | -0.9 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 125,798 | 33.2 | 130,867 | 34.0 | 0.8 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 28,080 | 7.4 | 29,470 | 7.7 | 0.3 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 9,010 | 2.4 | 9,501 | 2.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 378,876 | 100.0 | 384,383 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | No Vehicles | 723 | 2.1 | 712 | 2.1 | -- |
|  | One Vehicle | 10,127 | 29.8 | 9,911 | 28.8 | -1.0 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 16,597 | 48.7 | 16,924 | 49.2 | 0.5 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 5,296 | 15.6 | 5,515 | 16.0 | 0.4 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 1,284 | 3.8 | 1,327 | 3.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 34,027 | 100.0 | 34,389 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | No Vehicles | 6,582 | 8.8 | 5,052 | 6.7 | -2.1 |
|  | One Vehicle | 25,725 | 34.4 | 24,528 | 32.3 | -2.1 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 28,519 | 38.2 | 30,650 | 40.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 9,386 | 12.5 | 10,574 | 13.9 | 1.4 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 4,596 | 6.1 | 5,028 | 6.6 | 0.5 |
|  | Total | 74,808 | 100.0 | 75,832 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { c } \\ & \frac{1}{1} \\ & \frac{1}{3} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | No Vehicles | 2,000 | 5.1 | 2,351 | 5.9 | 0.8 |
|  | One Vehicle | 10,163 | 26.0 | 11,293 | 28.4 | 2.4 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 16,647 | 42.6 | 16,383 | 41.3 | -1.3 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 7,487 | 19.1 | 6,941 | 17.5 | -1.6 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 2,811 | 7.2 | 2,747 | 6.9 | -0.3 |
|  | Total | 39,108 | 100.0 | 39,715 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | No Vehicles | 2,573 | 5.0 | 1,816 | 3.5 | -1.5 |
|  | One Vehicle | 12,646 | 24.7 | 12,690 | 24.5 | -0.2 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 21,899 | 42.7 | 22,450 | 43.4 | 0.7 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 10,180 | 19.9 | 10,709 | 20.7 | 0.8 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 3,930 | 7.7 | 4,087 | 7.9 | 0.2 |
|  | Total | 51,228 | 100.0 | 51,752 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | No Vehicles | 7,422 | 4.9 | 7,039 | 4.6 | -0.3 |
|  | One Vehicle | 40,396 | 26.7 | 41,316 | 27.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 69,215 | 45.9 | 70,183 | 45.8 | -0.1 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 24,087 | 15.9 | 24,454 | 16.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 9,993 | 6.6 | 10,175 | 6.6 | -- |
|  | Total | 151,113 | 100.0 | 153,167 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | No Vehicles | 75,085 | 9.5 | 71,850 | 9.0 | -0.5 |
|  | One Vehicle | 284,654 | 35.9 | 283,174 | 35.3 | -0.6 |
|  | Two Vehicles | 304,482 | 38.4 | 313,636 | 39.1 | 0.7 |
|  | Three Vehicles | 92,686 | 11.7 | 96,091 | 12.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Four or More Vehicles | 35,818 | 4.5 | 37,249 | 4.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 792,725 | 100.0 | 802,000 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: 2006-2010 Census Transportation Planning Package and SEWRPC

Table C. 4
Comparison of the Distribution of the Percentage of Households by Income in the Region

| Household Income (in dollars) | Kenosha County |  |  | Milwaukee County |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | 2011 <br> Household Survey | Difference in Percent | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | 2011 <br> Household Survey | Difference in Percent |
| Under 20,000 | 5.1 | 8.9 | 3.8 | 8.8 | 11.8 | 3.0 |
| 20,000 to 39,999 | 13.7 | 22.1 | 8.4 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 0.4 |
| 40,000 to 49,999 | 9.1 | 8.8 | -0.3 | 9.9 | 10.9 | 1.0 |
| 50,000 to 74,999 | 20.6 | 19.7 | -0.9 | 22.2 | 25.0 | 2.8 |
| 75,000 to 99,999 | 19.3 | 18.5 | -0.8 | 16.6 | 14.5 | -2.1 |
| 100,000 or Over | 32.2 | 22.0 | -10.2 | 24.1 | 19.0 | -5.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- |
| Household Income (in dollars) | Ozaukee County |  |  | Racine County |  |  |
|  | 2011 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under 20,000 } \\ & 20,000 \text { to } 39,999 \\ & 40,000 \text { to } 49,999 \\ & 50,000 \text { to } 74,999 \\ & 75,000 \text { to } 99,999 \\ & 100,000 \text { or Over } \end{aligned}$ | 2.1 | 11.9 | 9.8 | 4.6 | 11.4 | 6.8 |
|  | 9.2 | 22.6 | 13.4 | 14.5 | 18.1 | 3.6 |
|  | 5.8 | 9.5 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 11.1 | 4.1 |
|  | 17.5 | 21.5 | 4.0 | 23.4 | 23.7 | 0.3 |
|  | 20.7 | 13.6 | -7.1 | 19.4 | 14.9 | -4.5 |
|  | 44.7 | 20.9 | -23.8 | 31.1 | 20.8 | -10.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- |
| Household Income (in dollars) | Walworth County |  |  | Washington County |  |  |
|  | 2011 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent |
| Under 20,000 | 5.4 | 11.4 | 6.0 | 2.6 | 9.6 | 7.0 |
| 20,000 to 39,999 | 14.0 | 20.8 | 6.8 | 9.7 | 20.9 | 11.2 |
| 40,000 to 49,999 | 8.4 | 11.0 | 2.6 | 6.9 | 13.6 | 6.7 |
| 50,000 to 74,999 | 25.6 | 25.5 | -0.1 | 21.8 | 22.2 | 0.4 |
| 75,000 to 99,999 | 20.0 | 14.3 | -5.7 | 22.8 | 14.8 | -8.0 |
| 100,000 or Over | 26.6 | 17.0 | -9.6 | 36.2 | 18.9 | -17.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- |
| Household Income (in dollars) | Waukesha County |  |  | Region |  |  |
|  | 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-2010 } \\ \text { CTPP } \end{gathered}$ | Household Survey | Difference in Percent |
| Under 20,000 | 2.2 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 5.8 | 11.1 | 5.3 |
| 20,000 to 39,999 | 7.4 | 19.2 | 11.8 | 14.1 | 19.5 | 5.4 |
| 40,000 to 49,999 | 5.6 | 10.7 | 5.1 | 8.2 | 10.8 | 2.6 |
| 50,000 to 74,999 | 17.2 | 22.5 | 5.3 | 21.1 | 23.7 | 2.6 |
| 75,000 to 99,999 | 20.1 | 16.2 | -3.9 | 18.6 | 15.1 | -3.5 |
| 100,000 or Over | 47.5 | 20.9 | -26.6 | 32.2 | 19.8 | -12.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- | 100.0 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: 2006-2010 Census Transportation Planning Package and SEWRPC

Table C. 5
Comparison of the Distribution of the Percentage of Households by Lifestyle in the Region

|  | Age of Head of Household | 2010 Federal Census |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference in Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent Distribution | Number | Percent Distribution |  |
|  | 65 or Older | 12,208 | 19.5 | 11,658 | 18.6 | -0.9 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 28,834 | 46.0 | 29,639 | 47.2 | 1.2 |
|  | with Children | 21,608 | 34.5 | 21,465 | 34.2 | -0.3 |
|  | Total | 62,650 | 100.0 | 62,762 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | 65 or Older | 74,402 | 19.4 | 68,329 | 17.8 | -1.6 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 193,543 | 50.5 | 212,416 | 55.2 | 4.7 |
|  | with Children | 115,646 | 30.1 | 103,638 | 27.0 | -3.1 |
|  | Total | 383,591 | 100.0 | 384,383 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | 65 or Older | 8,559 | 25.0 | 8,290 | 24.1 | -0.9 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 15,121 | 44.2 | 15,682 | 45.6 | 1.4 |
|  | with Children | 10,548 | 30.8 | 10,417 | 30.3 | -0.5 |
|  | Total | 34,228 | 100.0 | 34,389 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | 65 or Older | 16,953 | 22.4 | 15,688 | 20.7 | -1.7 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 34,456 | 45.6 | 35,844 | 47.3 | 1.7 |
|  | with Children | 24,242 | 32.0 | 24,300 | 32.0 | -- |
|  | Total | 75,651 | 100.0 | 75,832 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{7} \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 65 or Older | 8,981 | 22.6 | 9,208 | 23.2 | 0.6 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 18,707 | 47.1 | 18,643 | 46.9 | -0.2 |
|  | with Children | 12,011 | 30.3 | 11,864 | 29.9 | -0.4 |
|  | Total | 39,699 | 100.0 | 39,715 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | 65 or Older | 11,377 | 22.0 | 11,314 | 21.9 | -0.1 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 23,420 | 45.4 | 24,014 | 46.4 | 1.0 |
|  | with Children | 16,808 | 32.6 | 16,424 | 31.7 | -0.9 |
|  | Total | 51,605 | 100.0 | 51,752 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{\pi}{y} \\ & \underset{y}{2} \\ & \frac{1}{j} \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 65 or Older | 36,142 | 23.7 | 36,146 | 23.6 | -0.1 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 68,092 | 44.6 | 67,193 | 43.9 | -0.7 |
|  | with Children | 48,429 | 31.7 | 49,828 | 32.5 | 0.8 |
|  | Total | 152,663 | 100.0 | 153,167 | 100.0 | -- |
| $$ | 65 or Older | 168,622 | 21.1 | 160,633 | 20.0 | -1.1 |
|  | Under 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | without Children | 382,173 | 47.8 | 403,431 | 50.3 | 2.5 |
|  | with Children | 249,292 | 31.1 | 237,936 | 29.7 | -1.4 |
|  | Total | 800,087 | 100.0 | 802,000 | 100.0 | -- |

[^1]Table C. 6
Comparison of the Distribution of Population by Age Group in the Region

| Age Group | 2010 Federal Census |  | 2011 Resident Household Survey |  | Difference in Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |  |
| Under 5 years | 133,503 | 6.6 | 156,270 | 7.8 | 1.2 |
| 5 to 9 years | 137,010 | 6.8 | 138,254 | 6.9 | 0.1 |
| 10 to 14 years | 140,118 | 6.9 | 141,294 | 7.0 | 0.1 |
| 15 to 17 years | 87,644 | 4.3 | 87,652 | 4.4 | 0.1 |
| 18 and 19 years | 57,282 | 2.8 | 47,080 | 2.3 | -0.5 |
| 20 years | 28,168 | 1.4 | 21,600 | 1.1 | -0.3 |
| 21 years | 27,476 | 1.4 | 22,563 | 1.1 | -0.3 |
| 22 to 24 years | 81,951 | 4.1 | 80,221 | 4.0 | -0.1 |
| 25 to 29 years | 137,321 | 6.8 | 136,433 | 6.8 | -- |
| 30 to 34 years | 128,174 | 6.3 | 127,601 | 6.3 | -- |
| 35 to 39 years | 125,851 | 6.2 | 125,641 | 6.2 | -- |
| 40 to 44 years | 136,456 | 6.8 | 136,229 | 6.8 | -- |
| 45 to 49 years | 153,577 | 7.6 | 153,340 | 7.6 | -- |
| 50 to 54 years | 153,402 | 7.6 | 153,326 | 7.6 | -- |
| 55 to 59 years | 132,272 | 6.5 | 132,335 | 6.6 | 0.1 |
| 60 and 61 years | 46,132 | 2.3 | 46,134 | 2.3 | -- |
| 62 to 64 years | 59,626 | 3.0 | 59,665 | 3.0 | -- |
| 65 and 66 years | 31,045 | 1.5 | 31,033 | 1.5 | -- |
| 67 to 69 years | 41,577 | 2.1 | 41,519 | 2.1 | -- |
| 70 to 74 years | 54,925 | 2.7 | 54,620 | 2.7 | -- |
| 75 to 79 years | 46,609 | 2.3 | 45,731 | 2.3 | -- |
| 80 to 84 years | 39,940 | 2.0 | 38,193 | 1.9 | -0.1 |
| 85 years and older | 39,911 | 2.0 | 34,544 | 1.7 | -0.3 |
| Total | 2,019,970 | 100.0 | 2,011,278 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

Table C. 8 compares employed population estimates at the county and Region levels from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011 Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) and 2011 household travel survey. This comparison shows that the distribution of population by employment status was accurately estimated by the survey, with the distribution of employed people varying by no more than 0.4 percent at the county and Region levels.

Lastly, estimates of commercial truck availability, including estimates by type, as determined by the 2011 travel survey, were compared with corresponding estimates as derived from 2011 WisDOT Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), registration records. This comparison, shown in Table C.9, indicates a high degree of accuracy for the commercial truck data derived from the survey, within the Region.

The results of the accuracy checks of the household and truck travel survey with respect to socioeconomic characteristics and vehicle availability data indicate that the survey data demonstrate a high degree of accuracy and completeness, particularly considering that the surveys, Census, CTPP, and ACS were conducted in different years; the Census, CTPP, and ACS include the Region's group-quartered population and the household travel survey does not; and with respect to certain socioeconomic characteristics, the travel survey, CTPP, and ACS are all sample surveys.

Table C. 7
Comparison of the Distribution of Population Ages Five and Older by Gender in the Region

|  | Gender | 2010 Federal Census |  | 2011 Household Survey |  | Difference in Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Population | Percent Distribution | Population | Percent Distribution |  |
|  | Male | 76,861 | 49.5 | 74,546 | 49.2 | -0.3 |
|  | Female | 78,570 | 50.5 | 76,901 | 50.8 | 0.3 |
|  | Total | 155,431 | 100.0 | 151,446 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | Male | 422,425 | 48.1 | 413,540 | 47.9 | -0.2 |
|  | Female | 455,946 | 51.9 | 450,168 | 52.1 | 0.2 |
|  | Total | 878,371 | 100.0 | 863,708 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathscr{N} \\ \underset{y}{*} & \lambda \\ \vdots & \\ 0 & 0 \\ \text { O } \end{array}$ | Male | 39,994 | 48.9 | 39,509 | 49.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Female | 41,853 | 51.1 | 41,051 | 51.0 | -0.1 |
|  | Total | 81,847 | 100.0 | 80,561 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 0 \\ \stackrel{i}{3} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | Male | 90,251 | 49.4 | 86,536 | 48.6 | -0.8 |
|  | Female | 92,410 | 50.6 | 91,506 | 51.4 | 0.8 |
|  | Total | 182,661 | 100.0 | 178,039 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { c } \\ & \frac{1}{1} \\ & \frac{\lambda}{3} \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Male | 48,069 | 50.1 | 47,512 | 50.8 | 0.7 |
|  | Female | 47,963 | 49.9 | 46,070 | 49.2 | -0.7 |
|  | Total | 96,032 | 100.0 | 93,581 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | Male | 61,260 | 49.5 | 60,780 | 49.4 | -0.1 |
|  | Female | 62,448 | 50.5 | 62,271 | 50.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 123,708 | 100.0 | 123,052 | 100.0 | -- |
|  | Male | 180,487 | 49.0 | 178,933 | 49.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Female | 187,930 | 51.0 | 185,685 | 50.9 | -0.1 |
|  | Total | 368,417 | 100.0 | 364,620 | 100.0 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \hline \mathbf{0} \\ & \text { 0 } \end{aligned}$ | Male | 919,347 | 48.7 | 901,356 | 48.6 | -0.1 |
|  | Female | 967,120 | 51.3 | 953,652 | 51.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 1,886,467 | 100.0 | 1,855,008 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

Figure C. 3
Comparison of Age and Gender Composition of the Population Ages Five and Older in the Region


Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEWRPC

Table C. 8
Comparison of Employment Status in the Region

| County | Employment Status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 Local Area Unemployment Statistics |  | $\stackrel{2011}{\text { Household Survey }}$ |  | Difference in Percent |
|  | Employed People | Percent Distribution | Employed People | Percent Distribution |  |
| Kenosha | 78,800 | 8.3 | 76,600 | 7.9 | -0.4 |
| Milwaukee | 420,900 | 44.1 | 428,700 | 44.4 | 0.3 |
| Ozaukee | 44,200 | 4.6 | 44,100 | 4.6 | -- |
| Racine | 88,600 | 9.3 | 92,100 | 9.5 | 0.2 |
| Walworth | 51,000 | 5.3 | 50,300 | 5.2 | -0.1 |
| Washington | 69,300 | 7.3 | 71,700 | 7.4 | 0.1 |
| Waukesha | 201,100 | 21.1 | 202,300 | 21.0 | -0.1 |
| Region | 953,900 | 100.0 | 965,800 | 100.0 | -- |

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and SEWRPC

## Table C. 9

Comparison of Truck Registrations and Truck Availability in the Region

|  | 2011 Truck Registrations | 2011 Truck Survey |  | Difference |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent <br> Distribution | Number | Percent <br> Distribution | Number | Percent |
| Truck Classification | Nught | 60.1 | 67,300 | 55.3 | $-4,100$ | -5.7 |
| Medium and Heavy | 36,700 | 30.9 | 43,600 | 35.9 | 6,900 | 18.8 |
| Municipal | 10,700 | 9.0 | 10,700 | 8.8 | -- |  |

Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC

## TRAVEL ACCURACY CHECKS

The travel accuracy checks include comparisons of travel to work characteristics as obtained from the ACS datasets and from the 2011 travel survey. The comparisons include mode of travel to work and work purpose travel between the counties of the Region. In considering these comparisons, it must be recognized that the ACS data and travel survey data are both from sample surveys, and that the ACS data are not the same as the travel survey data. The ACS data represent the "usual" mode and location of work travel over the prior week, and the Commission travel survey data represent travel on a specific assigned survey day. Therefore, some difference between the travel survey and Census data should be expected.

Table C. 10 provides comparisons of the distribution of mode of travel to work by county as obtained from the 2009-2011 ACS data and from the 2011 travel survey. Table C. 11 compares county-to-county travel within the Region from place of residence to place of employment. The data from the two sources closely compare, particularly when the differences between the two surveys are considered.

To verify that travel into and out of the Region was adequately represented by the 2011 travel inventory, travel accuracy checks were conducted at the boundaries of the Region along a defined cordon line as shown on Map C.1. The findings shown in Table C. 12 indicated that the travel survey data accurately represented external travel affecting the Southeastern Wisconsin Region.

Another set of travel accuracy checks included comparisons of the travel survey data with traffic counts of vehicle crossings at selected east-west screenlines within the Region. Three screenlines, as shown on Map C.1, were defined

Table C. 10
Comparison of Mode Share for Travel to Work in the Region

|  | Source | Mode |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Drive Alone | Carpool | Public Transit | Taxi/ Motorcycle | Bicycle/Walk |  |
|  | 2009-2011 ACS | 86.1 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 87.7 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 1.6 | -3.3 | -0.2 | -0.3 | 2.2 | -- |
|  | 2009-2011 ACS | 77.4 | 11.3 | 6.0 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 79.2 | 6.5 | 5.3 | 0.5 | 8.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 1.8 | -4.8 | -0.7 | -0.3 | 4.0 | -- |
|  | 2009-2011 ACS | 88.2 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 92.4 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 4.2 | -3.6 | 0.3 | -0.3 | -0.6 | -- |
|  | 2009-2011 ACS | 86.9 | 8.8 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 91.2 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 4.3 | -4.3 | -0.6 | -0.7 | 1.3 | -- |
|  | 2009-2011 ACS | 83.1 | 10.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 93.6 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 10.5 | -6.8 | -0.5 | -- | -3.2 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Washington } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | 2009-2011 ACS | 89.2 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 93.4 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 4.2 | -5.3 | -- | 0.8 | 0.3 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Waukesha } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | 2009-2011 ACS | 90.2 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 95.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 4.8 | -4.4 | -0.5 | 0.3 | -0.2 | -- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { od } \\ & \text { 0, } \end{aligned}$ | 2009-2011 ACS | 83.2 | 9.6 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 86.9 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 3.7 | -4.7 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 1.7 | -- |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey and SEWRPC
Table C. 11
Comparison of the Distribution of the Percentage of County-to-County Work Travel in the Region

| County of Residence | Source | County of Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Kenosha | Milwaukee | Ozaukee | Racine | Walworth | Washington | Waukesha | Total |
|  |  | 76.25 | 5.90 | 0.16 | 14.05 | 1.79 | 0.03 | 1.82 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 75.66 | 4.94 | -- | 13.56 | 4.16 | 0.07 | 1.61 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | -0.59 | -0.96 | -0.16 | -0.49 | 2.37 | 0.04 | -0.21 | -- |
|  | 2006-2010 CTPP | 0.41 | 82.08 | 1.83 | 1.12 | 0.18 | 1.02 | 13.36 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 0.59 | 77.03 | 2.45 | 3.23 | 0.38 | 2.09 | 14.23 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 0.18 | -5.05 | 0.62 | 2.11 | 0.20 | 1.07 | 0.87 | -- |
|  | 2006-2010 CTPP | 0.14 | 34.52 | 52.93 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 4.59 | 7.53 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 0.13 | 33.74 | 48.21 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 10.78 | 6.89 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | -0.01 | -0.78 | -4.72 | -0.01 | -0.03 | 6.19 | -0.64 | -- |
| $$ | 2006-2010 CTPP | 7.63 | 17.38 | 0.13 | 67.64 | 1.77 | 0.15 | 5.30 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 8.65 | 17.34 | 0.09 | 66.78 | 1.97 | 0.11 | 5.06 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 1.02 | -0.04 | -0.04 | -0.86 | 0.20 | -0.04 | -0.24 | -- |
|  | 2006-2010 CTPP | 2.91 | 6.50 | 0.12 | 5.06 | 76.03 | 0.22 | 9.16 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 5.01 | 5.77 | -- | 4.32 | 78.71 | -- | 6.19 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 2.10 | -0.73 | -0.12 | -0.74 | 2.68 | -0.22 | -2.97 | -- |
|  | 2006-2010 CTPP | 0.10 | 21.37 | 6.99 | 0.33 | 0.02 | 51.52 | 19.67 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 0.10 | 17.56 | 6.06 | 0.05 | -- | 60.29 | 15.94 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | -- | -3.81 | -0.93 | -0.28 | -0.02 | 8.77 | -3.73 | -- |
|  | 2006-2010 CTPP | 0.28 | 31.59 | 0.83 | 1.07 | 0.64 | 1.80 | 63.79 | 100.00 |
|  | 2011 Household Survey | 0.31 | 31.23 | 1.11 | 1.81 | 0.97 | 4.06 | 60.51 | 100.00 |
|  | Difference in Percent | 0.03 | -0.36 | 0.28 | 0.74 | 0.33 | 2.26 | -3.28 | -- |

Source: 2006-2010 Census Transportation Planning Package and SEWRPC

Map C. 1
Travel Inventory Cordon Line and Screenline Locations for Accuracy Checks
2010 CENSUS-DEFINED
URBANIZED AREAS
2011 SCREENLINE
$\square \quad$ EXTERNAL CORDON LINE

EXTERNAL CORDON LINE STATION

Table C. 12
Comparison of Estimated Average Weekday Traffic Volumes Crossing the Region Boundary: 2011

| Region Boundary Cordon Line Segment | Estimated Average Weekday Traffic Volumes |  | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Traffic Counts | Travel Survey Data | Number | Percent |
| Northern | 46,700 | 51,000 | 4,300 | 9.2 |
| Western | 160,100 | 164,600 | 4,500 | 2.8 |
| Southern | 178,500 | 165,700 | -12,800 | -7.2 |
| Total | 385,300 | 381,300 | -4,000 | -1.0 |

Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC

## Table C. 13

Comparison of Estimated Average Weekday Vehicular Traffic Crossing Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine Screenlines: 2011

|  | Estimated Average <br> Weekday Traffic Volumes |  | Difference |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Screenline | Traffic Counts | Travel Survey Data | Number |  |
| Kenosha | 227,900 | 198,800 | $-29,100$ |  |
| Milwaukee | 957,300 | 959,400 | -12.8 |  |
| Racine | 215,200 | 212,200 | -100 |  |

Source: SEWRPC
in the Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha urbanized areas. These screenlines parallel natural or manmade barriers to minimize undetected crossings. The Milwaukee screenline, which roughly paralleled IH 94, extended across the Region from the Waukesha-Jefferson County line on the west to Lake Michigan on the east. The results of the screenline accuracy checks on the travel survey data, as shown in Table C.13, indicated that the simulated traffic volumes from the travel survey data accurately represented actual traffic counts in 2011, accounting for 87.2 percent of the traffic volumes crossing the screenlines in Kenosha, 100.2 percent in Milwaukee, and 98.6 percent in Racine. It should be noted that freeway reconstruction activities in 2011 likely impacted the accuracy of the Kenosha screenline traffic counts collected in 2011, overstating the difference between the travel survey data and estimated actual traffic flows.

The final major travel accuracy check compared simulated VMT by county and for the Region as derived from the travel surveys and estimated actual VMT based upon traffic counts. As shown in Table C.14, VMT as derived from the 2011 travel inventory varied by 4.4 to 13.4 percent from estimated actual VMT at the county level. At the regional level, simulated VMT represented 98.1 percent of total VMT estimated from traffic counts, indicating that the simulated travel from travel survey data accurately replicates travel in the Region.

The results of socioeconomic and travel accuracy checks on the travel inventory data indicate that the 2011 travel surveys are able to replicate regional socioeconomic characteristics and travel with a high degree of accuracy and completeness.

Table C. 14
Comparison of Estimated Average Weekday Arterial Vehicle-Miles of Travel in the Region: 2011

|  | Estimated Average Weekday <br> Vehicle-Miles of Travel (Thousands) |  | Difference |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County | Traffic Counts | Travel Survey Data | Number |  |
| Kenosha | 3,497 | 3,235 | -262 | -7.5 |
| Milwaukee | 16,210 | 14,035 | $-2,175$ | -13.4 |
| Ozaukee | 2,378 | 2,482 | 104 | 4.4 |
| Racine | 3,468 | 3,917 | 449 | 12.9 |
| Walworth | 2,452 | 2,726 | 274 | 11.2 |
| Washington | 3,442 | 3,771 | 329 | 9.6 |
| Waukesha | 9,415 | 9,938 | 523 | 5.6 |
|  | 40,862 | 40,104 | -758 | -1.9 |

Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC


[^0]:    ${ }^{54}$ A screenline is an imaginary line extending through a selected portion of a geographic area along natural or built barriers, providing a limited number of crossing points established for the purpose of comparing and analyzing travel data, as estimated from traffic counts, with data derived from travel surveys. A cordon line is an imaginary line extending around a selected geographic area for the purpose of comparing and analyzing external travel data, as estimated from traffic counts, with data derived from travel surveys.
    ${ }^{55}$ The lifestyle of a household is defined by whether a household is a retired or working household, determined by whether age of head of household is less than or greater than 65, respectively, and whether the working household includes children.

[^1]:    Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC

