TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study Parts 2 and 3

National Capital Region

January 2011



TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study Parts 2 and 3

National Capital Region

January 2011

HDR | iTRANS

1545 Carling Avenue, Suite 410 Ottawa, ON K1Z 8P9 Tel: (613) 234-7575 Fax: (613) 238-6096 <u>www.hdrinc.com</u> <u>www.itransconsulting.com</u>

Project # 5578

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

HDR | iTRANS Project Team

Principal	David Kriger, P.Eng., MCIP
Project Manager	Suzette Shiu, P.Eng.
Technical Team	Rhys Wolff, P.Eng. Veronica Restrepo, E.I.T. Kevin Shen, B.Sc. Don Cleghorn, P.Eng. Krista Tanaka, P.Eng.
Advisor	Alan E. Pisarski



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Acknowledgements

We thank the following study committee participants for the insight and comments that they have provided over the course of the study:

Ahmad Subhani, Project Manager (City of Ottawa) Mona Abouhenidy (City of Ottawa) Robert Calladine (City of Ottawa) Hanako Cardinal (Ministère des Transports du Québec) Sundar Damodaran (Ontario Ministry of Transportation) Carmel Dufour (Société de transport de l'Outaouais) Carol Hébert (Ville de Gatineau) Arto Keklikian (National Capital Commission) Pramod Kumar (Ontario Ministry of Transportation) Brigitte St-Pierre (Ministère des Transports du Québec) Pierre Tremblay (Ministère des Transports du Québec) Ramana Zanfongnon (Ville de Gatineau)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Table of Contents

1.	Intr	oduction	1
	1.1	Report objectives	1
	1.2	Report structure	1
	1.3	Study area	2
2.	Den	nographic Structure	4
	2.1	Population and employment distribution	4
	2.2	Urban densities	27
	2.3	Household characteristics	29
	2.4	Conclusion	37
3.	Tra	nsportation Activity	39
	3.1	Trip distribution patterns	39
	3.2	Work trip profiles	50
	3.3	Trips by purpose	55
	3.4	Conclusion	58
4.	Moo	lal Shares	59
	4.1	Mode availability	59
	4.2	Mode choice overview	64
	4.3	Mode choice by location	81
	4.4	Ridesharing patterns	87
	4.5	Conclusion	90
5.	Pub	lic Transit	91
	5.1	Demographic characteristics of transit users	91
	5.2	Household characteristics of transit users	93
	5.3	Transit trip purposes	97
	5.4	Transit trips to work	99
	5.5	Conclusion	103
6.	Ider	ntification of Trends	105
	6.1	Demographic patterns	105
	6.2	Transit, ridesharing and non-motorized mode share	105
	6.3	Gender balance	105
	6.4	Trip distribution patterns	106
	6.5	Time of day variation	106
	6.6	Impact of urban density	106
	6.7	Major trends	106
7.	Exti	rapolation of Trends	107
	7.1	Shift to suburbs	107
	7.2	Gender balance	116
	7.3	Trip rates	120
	7.4	Transit and non-motorized mode share	124
	7.5	Analysis	127
	7.6	Conclusions	128
8.	Con	clusions	129

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Appendices

A.	Origin-Destination Flows by District	
B.	Tables of Trip-based Indicators	
C.	Tables of Region-based Indicators	
D.	Tables of District-based Indicators	
E.	Tables of Extrapolations	

Tables

Table 3-1: AM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 2005	41
Table 3-2: AM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1995	42
Table 3-3: AM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1986	43
Table 3-4: PM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 2005	44
Table 3-5: PM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1995	45
Table 3-6: PM Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1986	46
Table 3-7: Midday Off-Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 2005	47
Table 3-8: Midday Off-Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1995	48
Table 3-9: Midday Off-Peak Period trips between aggregated districts, 1986	49
Table 3-10: Trip rates by age group and region	57
Table 3-11: Comparison of work trip rates, 1986-2006	58

Exhibits

Exhibit 1-1: Geographical Area (rural districts not shown in full)2
Exhibit 2-1: National Capital Region Population Totals, 1986-20055
Exhibit 2-2: National Capital Region Employment Totals, 1986-2005
Exhibit 2-3: NCR Population by District, 1986-20057
Exhibit 2-4: NCR Population by Age Group, 1986-2005
Exhibit 2-5: NCR Population Distribution by Age Group, 1986-2005
Exhibit 2-6: Ontario and Québec Population Distribution by Age Group, 1986-2005 9
Exhibit 2-7: Relative Change in Central Area Population, 1986-2005 10
Exhibit 2-8: Relative Change in Central Ottawa Employment, 1986-2005 10
Exhibit 2-9: Relative Change in Central Gatineau (Île de Hull) Employment, 1996-
2005
Exhibit 2-10: NCR Employed Labour Force and Jobs by District, 1986-200512
Exhibit 2-11: Central/Urban Ottawa Change in Population, ELF and Jobs, 1986-2005 13
Exhibit 2-12: Central/Urban Gatineau Change in Population and ELF, 1986-2005 14
Exhibit 2-13: Suburban Ottawa Change in Population, ELF and Jobs, 1986-2005 14
Exhibit 2-14: Suburban Gatineau Change in Population and ELF, 1986-200515
Exhibit 2-15: Rural Ontario Districts Change in Population, ELF and Jobs, 1986-2005. 15
Exhibit 2-16: Rural Québec Districts Change in Population and ELF, 1986-2005 16
Exhibit 2-17: Workers per household, 1986-2005 17
Exhibit 2, 19, John non-maidant wankan by district 1096, 2005

Exhibit 2-19: Jobs per resident worker by district (excluding downtown cores), 1986-	10
	19
Exhibit 2-20: NCR Job-Labour Force Surplus by District, 1986-2005	20
Exhibit 2-21: Method of calculating surplus daily work trips	21
Exhibit 2-22: NCR Extent of Daily Inter-District Work Travel, 1986-2005	22
Exhibit 2-23: NCR Population by Age Group and Occupation Status, 1986-2005	23
Exhibit 2-24: Ontario Population by Age Group and Occupation Status, 1986-2005	23
Exhibit 2-25: Québec Population by Age Group and Occupation Status, 1986-2005	24
Exhibit 2-26: NCR Employment Status, 1986-2005	24
Exhibit 2-27: NCR Full-time Labour Force Activity by Age and Gender, 1986-2005	25
Exhibit 2-28: Ontario Full-time Labour Force Activity by Age and Gender, 1986-	
2005	26
Exhibit 2-29: Québec Full-time Labour Force Activity by Age and Gender, 1986-	
2005	26
Exhibit 2-30: Urban density (population and jobs)/sq km (central districts), 1986-	
2005	28
Exhibit 2-31: Urban density (population and jobs) / sq km (suburban/rural districts),	
1986-2005	28
Exhibit 2-32: NCR household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005	30
Exhibit 2-33: Ontario household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005	31
Exhibit 2-34: Québec household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005	32
Exhibit 2-35: NCR household characteristics (percentage of households), 1986-2005	33
Exhibit 2-36: Ontario household characteristics (percentage of households), 1986-	
2005	34
Exhibit 2-37: Ouébec household characteristics (percentage of households), 1986-	
2005	35
Exhibit 2-38: Average vehicles per household by district. 1986-2005	36
Exhibit 2-39: Average people per household by district. 1986-2005	37
Exhibit 3-1: Changes in Trin Length Distribution by Origin District Type 1995-2005	40
Exhibit 3-2: Average work trin length 1995-2005	51
Exhibit 3-3: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk \pm bike) by place of	51
residence in high-density areas 2005	52
Exhibit 3-4. Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk \pm bike) by place of	52
residence in high-density areas 1995	52
Exhibit 3-5: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk \pm bike) by place of	52
residence in high_density areas 1086	53
Exhibit 3 6: Descentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of	55
residence in suburban and rural areas. 2005	53
Exhibit 2 7: Dereantege of non-motorized commuters (welk + bike) by place of	55
Exhibit 5-7. Percentage of non-motorized commuters (wark + bike) by place of	51
Exhibit 2 9. Demonstrate of non-motorized commutant (wells + hile) by place of	34
Exhibit 5-6: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of	51
residence in suburban and rural areas, 1986	54
Exhibit 5-9: Irip breakdown by detailed destination purpose (AM peak periods,	
1986-2005)	55

Exhibit 3-10: Trip rate breakdown by detailed destination purpose (AM peak periods,	
1986-2005)	. 56
Exhibit 3-11: Trip breakdown by detailed destination purpose (PM peak periods,	F (
1986-2005)	. 56
Exhibit 3-12: Trip rate breakdown by detailed destination purpose (PM peak periods, 1986-2005)	57
Exhibit 4-1: NCR driver's licence holders by occupation status 1986-2005	59
Exhibit 4-2: Ontario driver's licence holders by occupation status, 1986-2005	60
Exhibit 4-3: Québec driver's licence holders by occupation status, 1986-2005	60
Exhibit 4-4: Transit pass holders by occupation status, 2005	61
Exhibit 4-5: NCR vehicle sufficiency per worker 1986-2005	62
Exhibit 4-6: Ontario vehicle sufficiency per worker, 1986-2005	. 02 62
Exhibit 4-7: Québec vehicle sufficiency per worker, 1986-2005	63
Exhibit 4-8: NCR change in vehicle sufficiency per worker by district 1986-2005	63
Exhibit 4-9: Ontario change in vehicle sufficiency per worker by district, 1986-2005	. 05
Exhibit 4-10: Outline change in vehicle sufficiency per worker by district, 1986-2005.	. 0 <i>3</i>
Exhibit 4-10: Quebee change in venicle sufficiency per worker by district, 1760-2005 Exhibit 4-11: Work trin breakdown by mode 1986-2005	. 04
Exhibit 4-12: School trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005	. 05
Exhibit 4-12: School up bleakdown by mode, 1986-2005	. 05
Exhibit 4-13. Serve passenger trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005	. 00
Exhibit 4-15: Other trip breakdown by mode 1086-2005	. 00
Exhibit 4-16: Trip breakdown by time of day, 1986-2005	. 00
Exhibit 4-17: Trip breakdown by mode and time period 1986-2005	. 07
Exhibit 4-18: 2005 Mode share (AM neak period)	. 07
Exhibit 4-19: 2005 Mode share (AM peak period)	. 00 69
Exhibit 4-20: 1086 Mode share (AM peak period)	60
Exhibit 4-21: 2005 Mode share (PM neak period)	70
Exhibit 4-22: 1995 Mode share (PM neak period)	70
Exhibit 4-22: 1995 Mode share (PM peak period)	. 70
Exhibit 4-23: 1960 Mode share (Midday off-neak period)	. / 1
Exhibit 4-25: 1005 Mode share (Midday off-peak period)	. 71
Exhibit 4-26: 1996 Mode share (Midday off-peak period)	. 72
Exhibit 4-20: 1700 Wold share (windday on-peak period)	. 12
2005	73
Exhibit 4-28: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages) 2005	75
Exhibit 4-20: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages), 2005	. 75
1995	74
Exhibit 4-30: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages) 1995	74
Exhibit 4-31: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (absolute numbers)	• • •
1986	. 75
Exhibit 4-32: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages), 1986	.75
Exhibit 4-33: Trip breakdown by mode and licence status. 1986-2005	. 76
Exhibit 4-34: Modal trip rate trends by licence status. 1986-2005	. 76
Exhibit 4-35: Trip breakdown by mode and gender, 1986-2005	. 77
Exhibit 4-36: Male auto driver mode share by age group. 1986-2005	. 77
J 0 0 F	-

Exhibit 4-37: Male auto passenger mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 77
Exhibit 4-38: Male transit / school bus mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 78
Exhibit 4-39: Male non-motorized mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 78
Exhibit 4-40: Male 'other' mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 78
Exhibit 4-41: Female auto driver mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 79
Exhibit 4-42: Female auto passenger mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 79
Exhibit 4-43: Female transit / school bus mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 79
Exhibit 4-44: Female non-motorized mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 80
Exhibit 4-45: Female 'other' mode share by age group, 1986-2005	. 80
Exhibit 4-46: AM Peak Period Mode Shares (NCR), 1986-2005	. 81
Exhibit 4-47: AM Peak Period Origin Mode Shares (Ontario), 1986-2005	. 82
Exhibit 4-48: AM Peak Period Origin Mode Shares (Québec), 1986-2005	. 82
Exhibit 4-49: AM Peak Period Destination Mode Shares (Ontario), 1986-2005	. 82
Exhibit 4-50: AM Peak Period Destination Mode Shares (Québec), 1986-2005	. 83
Exhibit 4-51: AM Peak Period Origin + Destination Mode Shares (Ottawa Centre),	
1986-2005	. 84
Exhibit 4-52: AM Peak Period Origin Mode Shares by District Type, 1995-2005	. 85
Exhibit 4-53: AM Peak Period Destination Mode Shares by District Type, 1995-2005	. 85
Exhibit 4-54: Transit work trip mode share by district type, 1986-2005	. 86
Exhibit 4-55: Choice of auto passenger mode by geographic location of residence,	
1986-2005	. 88
Exhibit 4-56: Ridesharing patterns by household size (NCR), 1986-2005	. 89
Exhibit 4-57: Ridesharing patterns by household size (Ontario), 1986-2005	. 89
Exhibit 4-58: Ridesharing patterns by household size (Québec), 1986-2005	. 89
Exhibit 4-59: Ridesharing patterns by time period, 1995-2005	. 90
Exhibit 5-1: NCR transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005	. 91
Exhibit 5-2: Ontario transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005	. 91
Exhibit 5-3: Québec transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005	. 92
Exhibit 5-4: NCR transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005	. 92
Exhibit 5-5: Ontario transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005	. 92
Exhibit 5-6: Québec transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005	. 93
Exhibit 5-7: Transit mode share by household number of workers, 1986-2005	. 93
Exhibit 5-8: Transit mode share by household number of vehicles, 1986-2005	. 94
Exhibit 5-9: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (NCR), 1986-2005	. 94
Exhibit 5-10: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (Ontario), 1986-2005	. 95
Exhibit 5-11: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (Québec), 1986-2005	. 95
Exhibit 5-12: NCR transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005	. 96
Exhibit 5-13: Ontario transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005	. 96
Exhibit 5-14: Québec transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005	. 96
Exhibit 5-15: Transit mode share by trip purpose, 1986-2005	. 97
Exhibit 5-16: Absolute (percentage point) change in transit shares by purpose, 1986-	07
ZUUD	.9/
Exhibit 5-17. Kelative change in transit shares by purpose, 1980-2005.	. 78 00
EXHIBIT 5-18: NCK WORK UP transit mode share by nousehold size, 1986-2005	. 99 100
Exhibit 5-19: NCK work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005 J	100

Exhibit 5-20: NCR work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005	100
Exhibit 5-21: Ontario work trip transit mode share by household size, 1986-2005	100
Exhibit 5-22: Ontario work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005	101
Exhibit 5-23: Ontario work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005	101
Exhibit 5-24: Québec work trip transit mode share by household size, 1986-2005	101
Exhibit 5-25: Québec work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005	102
Exhibit 5-26: Québec work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005	102
Exhibit 5-27: Transit mode share by employment density, 1986-2005	103
Exhibit 7-1: Urban-suburban resident trend (NCR)	108
Exhibit 7-2: Urban-suburban resident trend (Ontario)	108
Exhibit 7-3: Urban-suburban resident trend (Québec)	109
Exhibit 7-4: Urban-suburban employment trend (NCR)	110
Exhibit 7-5: Urban-suburban employment trend (Ontario)	110
Exhibit 7-6: Urban-suburban employment trend (Québec)	110
Exhibit 7-7: AM peak trips to suburban/rural areas (Ontario)	111
Exhibit 7-8: AM peak trips to suburban/rural areas (Québec)	112
Exhibit 7-9: AM peak trips from suburban/rural areas (Ontario)	112
Exhibit 7-10: AM peak trips from suburban/rural areas (Québec)	112
Exhibit 7-11: AM Peak trip proportions to CBD (Ottawa Centre and Île de Hull)	113
Exhibit 7-12: Average vehicles per household	114
Exhibit 7-13: Proportion of zero-car households	115
Exhibit 7-14: Proportion of detached-house households	115
Exhibit 7-15: Female representation in full-time workforce	116
Exhibit 7-16: Transit mode shares (ages 25-54)	117
Exhibit 7-17: Transit mode shares (ages 55-64)	118
Exhibit 7-18: Transit mode shares (ages 65+)	118
Exhibit 7-19: Auto drive mode shares (ages 25-54)	118
Exhibit 7-20: Auto drive mode shares (ages 55-64)	119
Exhibit 7-21: Auto drive mode shares (ages 65+)	119
Exhibit 7-22: Daily trips/capita (ages 11 and up)	120
Exhibit 7-23: Daily work trips/capita (ages 11 and up)	121
Exhibit 7-24: Daily non-work trips/capita (ages 11 and up)	122
Exhibit 7-25: Distribution of trips by age grouping (Ontario districts)	123
Exhibit 7-26: Distribution of trips by age grouping (Québec districts)	123
Exhibit 7-27: Daily trip rates by age group (Ontario districts)	123
Exhibit 7-28: Daily trip rates by age group (Québec districts)	124
Exhibit 7-29: AM peak non-motorized mode share to CBD	125
Exhibit 7-30: Work trip transit mode share (rural residents)	126
Exhibit 7-31: Work trip transit mode share (central/urban residents)	126
Exhibit 7-32: Work trip transit mode share (suburban residents)	126

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

1. Introduction

1.1 Report objectives

The investigation of regional and inter-provincial travel trends in the National Capital Region (NCR) is divided into the following three components:

- firstly, identifying and describing key relationships between variables recorded in the 2005 TRANS National Capital Region household origin-destination (OD) survey, and thereby providing an understanding of significant transportation characteristics and patterns across the NCR (documented separately in the Part 1 report);
- secondly, using data from previous surveys in 1995 and 1986 in order to derive trends and to compare these trends with those in other cities; and
- thirdly, using the existing data and identified trends to extrapolate projected transportation patterns for future years for comparison with TRANS model forecasts.

This report, comprising Parts 2 and 3 of the three-step process, further examines the indicators selected in Part 1 by comparing their values in 1986 and 1995, where available, against the 2005 results (Part 2). Comparing the three years leads to a list of significant trends subsequently extrapolated in Part 3.

Data used are taken from the three NCR origin-destination surveys, with the exception of employment data (jobs by district of work) which were provided separately by the City of Ottawa or (for the 1996 Gatineau districts employment data) by the Ville de Gatineau from Statistics Canada.

1.2 Report structure

This report is divided into six chapters between the introduction and the conclusion, following and expanding on the structure of the Part 1 report, and organized as follows:

- Demographic structure, illustrating population, employment and household characteristics across the National Capital Region (described in Chapter 2);
- Transportation activity, illustrating how the demographic characteristics described previously influence the geographic attributes of trips, as well as the reasons for which they are made (described in Chapter 3);
- Modal shares, illustrating how the demographic, geographic and trip-based characteristics identified above help to define what method of travel will be chosen (described in Chapter 4);
- Public transit use, investigating the transit sub-component of the overall modal share in greater detail to determine what characteristics most appear to influence people in choosing to make a transit trip (described in Chapter 5);
- Identification of overall trends, based on a comparison and analysis of the four previous chapters, grouped into the categories of demographic shift, gender balance, trip rates and transit/non-motorized mode share (described in Chapter 6); and

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

• Extrapolation of major trends, based on those identified in the sixth part, to suggest future impacts of these trends and provide a comparison for modelled projections (described in Chapter 7).

1.3 Study area

Exhibit 1-1 depicts the study area. For the purposes of this report, four levels of aggregation are used, depending on the type of indicator. (For any given indicator, one or more may be used in order to show it more clearly).

Aggregation levels are:

- Overall (the National Capital Region as a whole).
- Provincial level (separation of the Ontario and Québec portions of the National Capital Region (NCR).
- Urban structural level (separation of city centre, urban, suburban, and rural elements of the Ontario and Québec portions of the NCR). In the exhibits that follow, "Ontario" and "Québec" are used to denote the respective sectors of the NCR.
- District level (breakdown of data to the level of the 26 districts of the NCR, which are shown in Exhibit 1-1).



Exhibit 1-1: Geographical area (rural districts not shown in full)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

The urban structural level separates the districts as follows:

- Central Ottawa (Ottawa Centre, Ottawa Inner Area);
- Central Gatineau (Île de Hull);
- Urban Ottawa (inside greenbelt), (Alta Vista, Bayshore/Cedarview, Beacon Hill, Hunt Club, Merivale, Ottawa East, Ottawa West);
- Suburban Ottawa (outside greenbelt), (Kanata/Stittsville, Orléans, South Gloucester/Leitrim, South Nepean);
- Urban Gatineau (Hull Périphérie);
- Suburban Gatineau (Aylmer, Gatineau Centre, Gatineau Est, Plateau)
- Rural Ontario (rural east, west, southeast and southwest); and
- Rural Québec (Masson-Angers, rural northeast and northwest).

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

2. Demographic Structure

This chapter looks at how population (all residents and all labour force participants) and employment, as well as household attributes, are distributed amongst the National Capital Region's districts, and what changes in these distribution patterns can be noted between 1986 and 2005. This gives an initial high-level identification of likely trip flow patterns (between areas of high population and nearby areas of high employment), which is investigated further in later chapters.

2.1 Population and employment distribution

Observed trends:

- Population grows fastest in suburban areas, with Orléans the most populous district in 2005 (up from fifth in 1986).
- Jobs grow by 60% outside the central Ottawa districts, but only by 20% within them. Between 1996 and 2005, employment in Île de Hull decreases by 4%, while employment elsewhere in Gatineau goes up by 30%.
- Beacon Hill, Kanata/Stittsville and Bayshore/Cedarview are net generators of trips to work prior to 2005, but then become net attractors. While Bayshore and Kanata become net attractors, jobs in the adjacent Rural West have decreased by 24% between 1995 and 2005.
- Many districts have increased their number of jobs compared to number of resident employees without resulting in more intra-district work trips. Alta Vista has 19,000 more jobs in 2005 than in 1995, but fewer Alta Vista residents work in that district. Bayshore has a similar pattern.
- Only Kanata/Stittsville has a large increase in jobs (7,000) for local residents, and has become significantly more self-contained over time.
- On the Québec side, the population growth is in Plateau and the rural districts, with other districts showing slow or negative growth from 1986 to 2005.
- Female workforce participation has grown from 40% in 1986 to 45% in 2005, with Gatineau growing faster than Ottawa in this regard.

The population of the National Capital Region (NCR) in 2005 was 1,150,579, including 865,695 residents of the 17 Ontario districts and 284,884 of the 9 Québec districts – a ratio of 75% - 25% between the two sides of the Ottawa River, compared with a ratio of 77%-23% in 1986 and 74%-26% in 1995.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

The geographical distribution of residents at the district level is shown in Exhibit 2-1, with a comparable distribution of jobs (at the same scale) shown in Exhibit 2-2. The overall population has increased from 798,688 (1986) and 984,690 (1995). This is an overall annual rate of increase from 1986 to 2005 of 1.94% (1.83% in Ontario and 2.30% in Québec), although Ottawa has grown faster than Gatineau since 1995. The largest areas of population growth over the 19-year period are in suburban Ottawa outside the greenbelt (3.36% annual rate) and the rural Québec districts (3.43% annual rate), both of which nearly doubled their population from 1986 to 2005.

The most recent year (i.e. 2005) is shown at the top, with the most distant (1986) at the bottom and 1995 in the middle.



Exhibit 2-1: National Capital Region population totals, 1986-2005

Between 1986 and 2005, the number of jobs in the Ontario part of the NCR increased by 50%, from 343,246 to 514,093. This is an annual increase of 2.15%, faster than the corresponding population growth either in the Ontario part of the NCR (1.84%) or in the NCR as a whole (1.94%). Growth was substantially faster from 1995 to 2005 (2.49% annually) than from 1986 to 1995 (1.77%).

Between 1996 and 2005, jobs in the Québec part of the NCR (1986 job data are not available, and 1996 is used in place of 1995) increase by 20%, for an annual increase of 2.09%, which is lower than the equivalent recent trend for Ontario. While the Ontario

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

districts added 112,000 jobs (28% growth) between 1995 and 2005, the Québec districts added 17,400 (21% growth) between 1996 and 2005.

The most recent year (i.e. 2005) is shown at the top, with the most distant (1986) at the bottom and 1995 in the middle (1986 is shown where available, and 1996 is used for Gatineau districts to represent 1995).



Exhibit 2-2: National Capital Region employment totals, 1986-2005

Exhibit 2-1 indicated that population on both sides of the Ottawa River is well-distributed among the east-west suburban districts, with Orléans and the Ottawa Inner Area having the highest number of residents and Kanata/Stittsville growing into one of the highest-populated districts. In contrast, Exhibit 2-2 shows a much more concentrated distribution of jobs compared with that of residents, with the focus on the central areas instead of the suburbs. Outside the central areas, however, Alta Vista has the highest concentration of jobs, with most of the remaining urban and suburban jobs located in west Ottawa.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Exhibit 2-3 provides a different look at the population (ranked by largest for 2005 first). This shows Orléans as the most populous district, having surpassed other districts such as Ottawa Inner Area, Bayshore and Alta Vista in recent years.



Exhibit 2-3: NCR population by district, 1986-2005

Exhibit 2-4 shows the distribution by age group, and how all age groups above 10 years old have shown an increase between 1995 and 2005. Exhibit 2-5 shows how the distribution of the population by age has remained reasonably constant over time, though with slight increases at the upper and lower ends.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-4: NCR population by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-5: NCR population distribution by age group, 1986-2005

Considering the Ontario and Québec districts separately, as is done below in Exhibit 2-6, it can be seen that, grouping the ages into three categories for residents 11 and over, while Ontario districts are not showing any particular trend, the Québec districts are showing a gradual aging of the population. This is reflected by a decline in the "young" category comprised largely of students and young workers and a gradual increase in the "retiree" category of those 65 and over while the middle category representing the main part of the workforce remains in the 68-69% range. Due to this pattern, the trip rates for the older category are likely to become more significant for Québec districts over time.





Exhibit 2-6: Ontario and Québec population distribution by age group, 1986-2005



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

As seen in Exhibit 2-7, Exhibit 2-8 and Exhibit 2-9, the population and employment is growing predominantly outside the three central districts. (In the population chart, "central area" includes the Île de Hull as well as the two Ottawa central districts, whereas the employment charts are separated, as for Gatineau there are employment data only for 1996 and 2005. For population, growth has been relatively constant over the two periods of 1986-1995 and 1995-2005, while for Ottawa employment, growth has accelerated since 1995. Though Île de Hull employment has decreased by 4% between 1996 and 2005, in the rest of Gatineau there has been a 30% increase, leading to a total increase in the Québec districts of over 17,000 jobs during this time period.



Exhibit 2-7: Relative change in Central Area population, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-8: Relative change in Central Ottawa employment, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-9: Relative change in Central Gatineau (Île de Hull) employment, 1996-2005

The central area population increases by 24,000 from 1986 to 2005, or 22,800 from 1995 to 2005, percentage changes of 18% and 17% respectively. This is similar to the 22% and 21% CBD population increases in Calgary and Vancouver from 1996 to 2006¹, and considerably more than the 4% in Montréal over the same period², though less than the 54% in CBD population growth experienced in Toronto between 1986 and 2006³ (27% between 1996 and 2006)⁴.

¹ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.27

² For comparisons with 1986 and 1987, the Montréal urban area refers to the island of Montréal, and the Greater Toronto urban area includes the municipalities of Toronto, Pickering, Ajax, Oakville, Mississauga, Brampton, Newmarket, Aurora, Richmond Hill, Markham and Vaughan. Comparisons with 1996 are made to either the respective CMA or (if specified as such) the Existing Urban Area (EUA), i.e., the continually urbanized area around the city centre, but not rural areas or neighbouring municipalities with an intervening undeveloped sector. Full maps can be found in [Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, Appendix B].

³ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

⁴ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.27

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-10: NCR employed labour force and jobs by district, 1986-2005⁵

Exhibit 2-10, above, compares labour force (including only employed residents) and jobs across all the districts. For Québec districts, 1986 jobs are unavailable, and 1996 jobs are used instead of 1995 jobs. Ottawa Centre and Alta Vista have both shown a substantial increase in jobs in recent years, such that Alta Vista has passed Ottawa Inner Area as the district with the second greatest number of jobs, while Orléans, Kanata/Stittsville and South Nepean have the greatest increases in labour force (as was the case with population). Exhibit 2-11 to Exhibit 2-16, on the following pages, illustrate for each district the changes in population, labour force and employment between the survey years, both in absolute and relative terms. We can see from these a general decrease in the labour force in urban areas such as Merivale, Alta Vista and Beacon Hill, while suburban districts like South Nepean and Plateau increase substantially. In Gatineau, between 1996 and 2005, we can note a significant increase in jobs in Hull Périphérie (almost equal to the change in population and a much higher percentage), and

⁵ 1996 job figures used for Québec districts in place of 1995 jobs

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



a very large rate of increase in both population and employment in Plateau, starting from a low number in 1996.

Exhibit 2-11: Central/Urban Ottawa change in population, ELF and jobs, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-12: Central/Urban Gatineau change in population and ELF, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-13: Suburban Ottawa change in population, ELF and jobs, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-14: Suburban Gatineau change in population and ELF, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-15: Rural Ontario districts change in population, ELF and jobs, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-16: Rural Québec districts change in population and ELF, 1986-2005

Over the entire urban area (approximated by taking all non-"rural" districts), the population increases by 47% between 1986 and 2005, or 19% between 1996 and 2005. This growth rate is similar to that of the Greater Toronto urban area (43% between 1986 and 2006⁶, or 19% between 1996 and 2006⁷) and considerably greater than that of Montréal (6% between 1987 and 2008)⁸. It is between those of Vancouver (15% between 1996 and 2006) and Calgary (32% between 1996 and 2006)⁹.

Exhibit 2-17 compares the average number of workers per household at the district level. Although there is somewhat of a trend towards lower average numbers of workers as employment density increases (and, to some extent, population density), the overall ratios are much closer together than population or employment. The higher rates in the rural and newer suburban districts are consistent with expectations, and have shown a decrease over time as density increases. We should note also that the populations of the two downtown centres and of the rural districts are small; meaning that the significance of these 'extremities' may be distorted.



⁶ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

⁷ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.27

⁸ Secrétariat aux enquêtes Origine-Destination métropolitaines, Enquête Origine-Destination 2008 Faits Saillants, Agence métropolitaine de transport, 2008, p.14

⁹ TAC, December 2009, p.27

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 2-17: Workers per household, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

In contrast to this relative similarity, the number of jobs per resident worker by district features a huge difference between downtown Ottawa, which has grown from 14 jobs per resident worker in 1995 to 24 in 2005, or Île de Hull, which has remained at around 6 jobs per worker, to rural areas with a small fraction of a job per worker. This pattern has remained largely constant over time. The full spread of district ratios is given in Exhibit 2-18, which expresses the comparison of jobs and workers presented in Exhibit 2-10 in terms of ratios.



Exhibit 2-18: Jobs per resident worker by district, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-19: Jobs per resident worker by district (excluding downtown cores), 1986-2005

Employment data for the Québec districts are only available for 2005 and 1996, so job ratios for 1986 are just shown for Ontario districts, and 1996 is used to approximate 1995 in Gatineau.

Exhibit 2-19, above, excludes the two downtowns of Ottawa Centre and Île de Hull. This is because those two districts have such a high job to resident worker ratio that it is difficult to distinguish between the ratios of the remaining districts (as in Exhibit 2-18) when all are shown together. The ratio of jobs to workers in Alta Vista can now be seen to have grown significantly between 1995 and 2005. Even more dramatic changes are noticed in South Gloucester and in Plateau, but here the absolute numbers for 1995-1996 are quite small (only 700 jobs for South Gloucester, and 200 for Plateau) which accounts for the impact on the ratio.



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

In Exhibit 2-20, below, the number of jobs in each district is compared with the employed labour force in that district to calculate the surplus or deficit in jobs. Ottawa Centre has 95,000 more jobs than employed residents (an increase of 20,000 since 1995), and other central and urban areas such as Alta Vista and Île de Hull also have job surpluses, while the majority of districts have more employees than jobs (Orléans has a deficit that has been increasing over time, from around 25,000 in 1986 to 35,000 in 2005). Some districts have gone from being net generators of workers to being net generators of jobs (such as Beacon Hill and Kanata/Stittsville). Employment data are not available for the Québec districts before 1996, but from 1996 (used instead of 1995) to 2005, the most noticeable change is in Hull Périphérie, which gains 7,500 more jobs than workers.

The numbers in Exhibit 2-20 represent an estimate of the minimum necessary daily work movements to and from each district, based on the district's imbalance between jobs and resident workers. In Exhibit 2-22, these are compared with the actual number of externally-working residents to assess how self-contained each district is.



Exhibit 2-20: NCR job-labour force surplus by district, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Exhibit 2-22 shows how many additional work trips are required to and from each district beyond those resulting from the imbalance between workers and jobs, and what percentage of work trips made by residents of each district are made within the district. This is a measure of the self-containment of the district, or how efficient it is at providing jobs for its residents, and thus minimizing commuters' travel. Thus, for the sample "District X" depicted in Exhibit 2-21, there would need to be a minimum of 5 daily trips to work across the district boundary as there are 5 more resident workers than jobs. As there are in fact 15 cross-boundary trips to work, the surplus, such as is expressed for NCR districts on the left side of Exhibit 2-22, would be 15-5=10. Meanwhile, as there are 5 intra-district work trips, the intra-district percentage, such as is expressed for NCR districts on the right side of Exhibit 2-22, would be 33%, as 5 of the 15 workers who live in the district also work there.



Exhibit 2-21: Method of calculating surplus daily work trips

Some areas, such as Ottawa East, have similar numbers of workers and jobs, but such a large percentage of the resident workers travel elsewhere to their jobs (fewer than 15% work in Ottawa East) that the actual number of work trips exceeds the minimum number of work trips by over 40,000. In general, only Kanata/Stittsville residents have significantly increased their percentage of intra-district work trips since 1986 (from 16% to 31%, which puts this district behind only Ottawa Centre in terms of the proportion of its residents who work in the same district). In Gatineau, only Plateau has increased in self-containment, due to the increase in jobs there from virtually none in 1996. 1986 job data were not available, and 1996 jobs (but not work trips) are used to represent 1995, for the Québec districts.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-22: NCR extent of daily inter-district work travel, 1986-2005

The following series of exhibits (for the NCR overall and for Ontario and Québec separately) breaks the population down by age group and occupation status, comparing the three years. For 1986 and 1995 there were some people (particularly between the ages of 15 and 24) who were classified as both workers and students; in these cases anyone who identified themselves as a full-time worker and student was included in the full-time worker category only, and anyone who identified themselves as a student and part-time worker was included in the student category only. The 0-10 age group has definitions of a student that vary by survey, so is omitted from the comparison.





Exhibit 2-23: NCR population by age group and occupation status, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-24: Ontario population by age group and occupation status, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-25: Québec population by age group and occupation status, 1986-2005

In Exhibit 2-23, Exhibit 2-24 and Exhibit 2-25, above, similar demographic patterns are shown for both Ontario and Québec. The near 100% of students in the lower age range and near 100% neither student nor employed in the highest age category are as expected for all three geographical breakdowns. Once allowing for the fact that many part-time working students were not classified as such in 2005, the distribution appears similar across the three survey years, although there is a substantial drop in full-time employment in the 20-24 category between 1986 and 1995 as workers are replaced by students, and an overall drop in part-time employment between 1995 and 2005 (with full-time employment gaining).

If we combine the age categories, and remove the part-time workers that make the total exceed 100%, we notice in Exhibit 2-26 an overall drop in full-time employment from 51% to 48% between 1986 and 1995, and subsequent partial recovery to 49% in 2005.



Exhibit 2-26: NCR employment status, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

The exhibits below compare full-time employment proportions by gender (each age category adding up to 100%). The balances are similar across geographic areas and age groups, other than in categories where the sample size is very small, such as 15-19 and over 65. Between 1986 and 2005, the female share of the work force has increased from 40% to almost 45% across all age categories (although the 20-24 age category shows the opposite trend as female representation has dropped below 50% over the same time period). In 1986, women represented approximately the same share of the full-time work force in Québec (40.3%) and in Ontario (40.8%). By 2005, however, the Québec proportion had increased to 45.9%, while the Ontario equivalent had increased to only 44.5%, indicating that while female participation in the workforce is growing across the NCR, it is growing fastest in Gatineau.



Exhibit 2-27: NCR full-time labour force activity by age and gender, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-28: Ontario full-time labour force activity by age and gender, 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-29: Québec full-time labour force activity by age and gender, 1986-2005
Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

2.2 Urban densities

Observed trends:

- The difference between urban and suburban densities is decreasing over time
- No district shows a decrease in density; the fastest growing district, percentagewise, is South Gloucester/Leitrim (more than a 500% density increase), while the slowest is Ottawa East (15%).
- Kanata/Stittsville, Orléans and South Nepean add over 145,000 residents, almost half the total NCR population increase.
- Alta Vista, Merivale and Bayshore/Cedarview add more jobs than residents.
- From 1995 to 2005, Ontario district density increases faster than Québec district density.

To show urban densities, the five densest districts are separated from the remaining 21 due to the different magnitude of density for these central areas. The spread ranges from over 41,000 residents and jobs combined per square kilometre in Ottawa Centre in 2005 (by far the densest of the districts, and up by 20% compared with 1995) to fewer than 8 residents and jobs per square kilometre in the Rural West in 1986. For Québec districts, density can only be shown for 2005 and 1995 (using job numbers from 1996) as job figures are not available before that.

The highest absolute increase in density is found in Ottawa Centre (7,000 residents and jobs combined—Île de Hull, in contrast, shows a slight decline since 1995) but, percentagewise, this is low compared with some of the suburban districts such as South Nepean (increasing by four times) and Kanata/Stittsville (increasing by a factor of nearly three times) between 1986 and 2005. Although there are no Ontario districts that do not experience at least a 15% increase in density since 1986, the urban districts such as Ottawa Inner Area, Ottawa West and Ottawa East have much lower increases (15-20%) than the suburbs, and the only Gatineau districts to show large increases since 1995 are the low-density Plateau and Rural Northeast. Thus, the trend has been to reduce the disparities between urban and suburban density over time—in 1986 the density of Ottawa Inner Area was 26 times that of South Nepean, but in 2005 it was less than 8 times as dense.

From 1995 to 2005, the average density of districts in the Ontario part of the NCR increased by 25%, while the average density of districts in the Québec part increased by 15%.



Exhibit 2-30: Urban density (population and jobs)/sq km (central districts), 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-31: Urban density (population and jobs) / sq km (suburban/rural districts), 1986-2005



The density of the Ontario part of the NCR increases from an overall average of 314 people and jobs per square kilometre in 1986, through 383 in 1995 to 477 people and jobs per square kilometre in 2005. Excluding the rural districts, the equivalent numbers for 1986, 1995 and 2005 are 1,672, 1,951 and 2,422 people and jobs per square kilometre. Density increases in all districts.

Looking across Canada, the 2005 density approximates closely to other urban areas, such as Montréal (2,700 people and jobs per square kilometre), Vancouver (2,500) and Calgary (2,200). Only Toronto, at 4,000, is significantly denser (TAC, 2009, p. 28)¹⁰.

2.3 Household characteristics

Observed trends:

- Household size remains relatively constant, but average number of vehicles per household increases by 5%
- A larger percentage of households are inhabiting detached housing
- The number of two-vehicle households is increasing faster than the number of one-vehicle households
- The fastest-growing household size is the one-person household
- Average household sizes in Québec districts of the NCR have become smaller than those in Ontario districts.

The survey examines households in several different ways; these include number of people comprising the household, number of vehicles available for household use, and type of structure that the household inhabits. Details of these attributes are displayed in Exhibit 2-32, Exhibit 2-33 and Exhibit 2-34, below. These are also displayed showing the percentage of all households that fall into each category in Exhibit 2-35, Exhibit 2-36 and Exhibit 2-37. Dwelling types are shown only for 1986 and 2005. This is because the 1995 survey aggregated the types to "house" and "apartment", meaning that the 1995 results cannot be compared with the other years.

Household size has remained relatively constant in Ontario (averaging between 2.46 and 2.54 people) while in Québec there has been a decreasing trend from 2.63 in 1986 to 2.43 in 2005. Consequently, average household sizes in the Québec part of the NCR have become smaller than in the Ontario part. Both sectors reflect a trend of moves to detached housing, which has come to be preferred by a majority of households (55% in 2005, compared with 47% in 1986). There is also a rising overall trend in number of vehicles per household, (despite a drop from 1.34 to 1.27 from 1986 to 1995, the average subsequently increased to 1.41 by 2005).



¹⁰ Density figures refer to the Existing Urban Area (EUA), as defined previously.



Exhibit 2-32: NCR household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-33: Ontario household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 2-34: Québec household characteristics (absolute numbers), 1986-2005

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study







Exhibit 2-36: Ontario household characteristics (percentage of households), 1986-2005



Exhibit 2-37: Québec household characteristics (percentage of households), 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

In Exhibit 2-38 and Exhibit 2-39, the variation across the districts is shown for average number of vehicles per household and average household sizes. The pattern follows the inverse of the urban density pattern shown in Exhibit 2-30 and Exhibit 2-31. There is, however, not much variation over time, other than occasionally in suburban districts.



Exhibit 2-38: Average vehicles per household by district, 1986-2005

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 2-39: Average people per household by district, 1986-2005

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the following trends between 1986 and 2005:

- The areas of largest growth in terms of both population and employment are the suburbs, with central areas growing only by 18-19% and areas outside the centres growing by nearly 60% on average;
- The disparities in urban density between suburban and urban areas have been decreasing over time;
- Some districts outside the central areas have become net generators of jobs, such as Hull Périphérie, Beacon Hill and Kanata/Stittsville;
- Some districts have moved toward a much higher proportion of their labour force working within the district (Merivale), but others have gone in the opposite direction (Ottawa East);

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

- The female share of the workforce has increased over time from approximately 40% to approximately 45%;
- The proportion of households living in detached housing and the average number of vehicles per household have both increased, despite the average household size remaining approximately the same.

The next chapter focuses on linking the population, employment and household attributes through the analysis of trip patterns.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

3. Transportation Activity

This chapter expands on the demographic information presented previously by looking at historical trip flow patterns in terms of origin and destination, variation by time period and how far the purposes of trips affect their distribution.

3.1 Trip distribution patterns

Observed trends:

- No identifiable change can be seen in average (straight-line) trip lengths
- Trip rates per capita decline in all peak periods (for example, from 0.60 to 0.51 in the AM peak)
- 23% of AM peak trips are destined to suburban areas in 2005, compared with 12% in 1986
- Intra-urban area trips show only a small increase

The average straight-line length of a trip varies considerably depending on its point of origin or destination and the density of that origin or destination. Exhibit 3-1, below, indicates the extent of this disparity, from an average 2005 trip length of 14.7 km in the rural Ontario portion of the NCR to only 5.9 km in the urban Ontario proportion (downtown Ottawa). The distribution patterns by destination were found to be almost identical. Although it appears that the trips from rural areas appear to be increasing in length over time (though data were not available for 1986), while the shorter suburban or urban-origin trips do not show the same tendency (jobs are moving to the suburbs as well as residents), this is largely due to a sudden change in average trip length in the Rural West, which is likely affected by a small sample size, from 8.5 km in 1995 to 17.0 km in 2005, rather than an overall rural trend.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 3-1: Changes in trip length distribution by origin district type, 1995-2005

Details of the trip flow numbers between aggregated districts (urban, rural, and so on), are given for each of the three years in Table 3-1 to Table 3-9, below. Also shown are trip rates (based on population of the origin district for AM and off-peak trips, and population of the destination district for PM trips) and the percentage of all trips that each OD pairing represents. Trip rates by purpose are shown in the next section. The tables are colour-coded so that the highest-volume flows appear darker for quick reference (we can note that these are mainly intra-area trips or those to or from Central Ottawa). Origin districts are shown in rows, and destination districts in columns.

The survey data indicate there is a significant drop in AM trip rates post-1986, despite the overall 18% increase in AM peak trips. There is a pattern of trip redistribution with the percentage destined to central and urban Ottawa decreasing over time (from 73% of trips in 1986 to just 62% in 2005) and more trips to suburban areas taking their place (up from 12% to 23% over the same time frame). Overall, the EUA has a per capita trip rate of 0.60 in the AM peak in 1986, dropping to 0.51 in 2005. This is within the same range as Toronto (0.51 in 1986, 0.48 in 2006¹¹) and Montréal (0.55 in 1987, 0.58 in 2008¹²).

 ¹¹ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.
 ¹² Secrétariat aux enquêtes Origine-Destination métropolitaines, Enquête Origine-Destination 2008 Faits

Saillants, Agence métropolitaine de transport, 2008, p.20

	Central	Central	Urban	Urban Catinaau	Suburban	Suburban	Rural	Rural	Tetal
AM PEAK FLOWS	Ottawa	Gatilieau	Ottawa	Gatilieau	Ottawa	Gatilieau	Ontario	Quebec	10181
Central Ottawa	28810	1750	16970	850	2160	550	430	190	51720
Central Gatineau	1180	1020	1220	840	240	550	40	90	5160
Urban Ottawa	50920	4290	131240	2370	14180	1340	3600	420	208360
Urban Gatineau	4390	3920	2970	9480	330	3100	110	620	24920
Suburban Ottawa	24420	1970	46860	1580	56900	700	4130	220	136770
Suburban Gatineau	12570	6360	11410	12640	1750	31710	480	1930	78840
Rural Ontario	5280	390	12710	260	7710	260	11730	50	38380
Rural Quebec	2870	2400	3000	5030	530	8830	80	7880	30620
Total	130440	22090	226380	33040	83790	47030	20610	11400	574760
AM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.30	0.02	0.18	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.55
Central Gatineau	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.59
Urban Ottawa	0.12	0.01	0.31	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.49
Urban Gatineau	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.19	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.50
Suburban Ottawa	0.09	0.01	0.18	0.01	0.22	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.52
Suburban Gatineau	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.01	0.20	0.00	0.01	0.50
Rural Ontario	0.06	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.46
Rural Quebec	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.01	0.13	0.00	0.11	0.44
Total	0.11	0.02	0.20	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.50
AM PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	5.0%	0.3%	3.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	9.0%
Central Gatineau	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Urban Ottawa	8.9%	0.7%	22.8%	0.4%	2.5%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	36.3%
Urban Gatineau	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	1.6%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	4.3%
Suburban Ottawa	4.2%	0.3%	8.2%	0.3%	9.9%	0.1%	0.7%	0.0%	23.8%
Suburban Gatineau	2.2%	1.1%	2.0%	2.2%	0.3%	5.5%	0.1%	0.3%	13.7%
Rural Ontario	0.9%	0.1%	2.2%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Rural Quebec	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%	0.1%	1.5%	0.0%	1.4%	5.3%
Total	22.7%	3.8%	39.4%	5.7%	14.6%	8.2%	3.6%	2.0%	

Table 3-1: AM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 2005

AM PEAK ELOWS	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	27180	2480	16570	690	1180	530	250	70	48960
Central Gatineau	1570	1480	1290	1340	30	500	0	100	6310
Urban Ottawa	50230	4880	126690	1690	7600	570	2560	220	194440
Urban Gatineau	3560	3720	2670	9130	280	2290	60	320	22010
Suburban Ottawa	19010	2010	35920	630	28270	160	3170	80	89260
Suburban Gatineau	11330	7140	9810	9890	650	31040	110	1200	71170
Rural Ontario	4210	400	11750	120	4800	60	11150	20	32500
Rural Quebec	2750	1740	2190	2460	200	3790	10	7620	20760
Total	119840	23830	206890	25950	43010	38940	17310	9630	485400
AM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Île de Hull	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.33	0.03	0.20	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.60
Île de Hull	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.13	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.59
Urban Ottawa	0.13	0.01	0.33	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.51
Urban Gatineau	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.20	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.49
Suburban Ottawa	0.11	0.01	0.21	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.52
Suburban Gatineau	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.01	0.49
Rural Ontario	0.06	0.01	0.17	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.48
Rural Quebec	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.15	0.40
Total	0.13	0.02	0.22	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.51
AM PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Île de Hull	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	5.6%	0.5%	3.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	10.1%
Île de Hull	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Urban Ottawa	10.3%	1.0%	26.1%	0.3%	1.6%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	40.1%
Urban Gatineau	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	1.9%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	4.5%
Suburban Ottawa	3.9%	0.4%	7.4%	0.1%	5.8%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	18.4%
Suburban Gatineau	2.3%	1.5%	2.0%	2.0%	0.1%	6.4%	0.0%	0.2%	14.7%
Rural Ontario	0.9%	0.1%	2.4%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	6.7%
Rural Quebec	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	1.6%	4.3%
Total	24.7%	4.9%	42.6%	5.3%	8.9%	8.0%	3.6%	2.0%	

Table 3-2: AM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 1995

	Central	Central	Urban	Urban	Suburban	Suburban	Rural	Rural	
AM PEAK FLOWS	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ontario	Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	32480	3550	18320	870	960	410	170	100	56860
Central Gatineau	1340	2350	1380	1580	30	640	0	0	7330
Urban Ottawa	65000	7030	122160	1810	5900	930	1550	100	204490
Urban Gatineau	3920	3750	2910	8700	110	2280	0	210	21890
Suburban Ottawa	17520	2040	26930	740	16240	80	890	0	64440
Suburban Gatineau	10870	6070	6870	7140	300	18720	70	330	50360
Rural Ontario	4650	530	9200	210	3250	110	6430	20	24390
Rural Quebec	2490	1440	1910	2300	70	2200	0	6760	17160
Total	138270	26750	189680	23340	26870	25360	9120	7520	446910
AM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.43	0.05	0.24	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.75
Central Gatineau	0.12	0.21	0.12	0.14	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.65
Urban Ottawa	0.19	0.02	0.35	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59
Urban Gatineau	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.22	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.56
Suburban Ottawa	0.16	0.02	0.25	0.01	0.15	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.60
Suburban Gatineau	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.51
Rural Ontario	0.13	0.01	0.26	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.69
Rural Quebec	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.18	0.47
Total	0.18	0.04	0.25	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.60
AM PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	7.3%	0.8%	4.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
Central Gatineau	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Urban Ottawa	14.5%	1.6%	27.3%	0.4%	1.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	45.8%
Urban Gatineau	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	1.9%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%
Suburban Ottawa	3.9%	0.5%	6.0%	0.2%	3.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	14.4%
Suburban Gatineau	2.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	0.1%	4.2%	0.0%	0.1%	11.3%
Rural Ontario	1.0%	0.1%	2.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	5.5%
Rural Quebec	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%	3.8%
Total	30.9%	6.0%	42.4%	5.2%	6.0%	5.7%	2.0%	1.7%	

Table 3-3: AM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 1986

	Central	Central	Urban	Urban Cotinoou	Suburban	Suburban	Rural	Rural	Tatal
PM PEAK FLOWS	Ottawa	Gatmeau	Ottawa	Gathleau	Ottawa	Gathieau	Untario	Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	40050	1430	49050	4430	21490	11800	4360	3290	135910
Central Gatineau	1810	1180	3740	3590	1910	5790	230	2160	20410
Urban Ottawa	23530	1090	159880	3530	46850	10780	12200	3440	261300
Urban Gatineau	1210	1520	2600	12420	1310	12760	190	4750	36760
Suburban Ottawa	3850	210	20030	680	60840	1900	7370	570	95440
Suburban Gatineau	1270	850	2380	4980	770	40620	330	8300	59490
Rural Ontario	880	30	5220	90	5630	620	9690	270	22420
Rural Quebec	430	110	800	820	260	3590	100	8950	15050
Total	73030	6410	243690	30550	139050	87860	34450	31730	646770
PM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY DEST RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.42	0.16	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.12
Central Gatineau	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.02
Urban Ottawa	0.25	0.12	0.38	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.14	0.05	0.23
Urban Gatineau	0.01	0.17	0.01	0.25	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.07	0.03
Suburban Ottawa	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.23	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.08
Suburban Gatineau	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.12	0.05
Rural Ontario	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.02
Rural Quebec	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.13	0.01
Total	0.77	0.73	0.57	0.62	0.53	0.56	0.41	0.46	0.56
PM PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	6.2%	0.2%	7.6%	0.7%	3.3%	1.8%	0.7%	0.5%	21.0%
Central Gatineau	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	3.2%
Urban Ottawa	3.6%	0.2%	24.7%	0.5%	7.2%	1.7%	1.9%	0.5%	40.4%
Urban Gatineau	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	1.9%	0.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.7%	5.7%
Suburban Ottawa	0.6%	0.0%	3.1%	0.1%	9.4%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	14.8%
Suburban Gatineau	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.1%	6.3%	0.1%	1.3%	9.2%
Rural Ontario	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.1%	1.5%	0.0%	3.5%
Rural Quebec	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.4%	2.3%
Total	11.3%	1.0%	37.7%	4.7%	21.5%	13.6%	5.3%	4.9%	

Table 3-4: PM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 2005

PM PEAK ELOWS	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	40300	1320	47320	3440	16800	10570	3840	2510	126110
Central Gatineau	2,660	1950	4370	4280	1580	6890	380	1680	23780
Urban Ottawa	22430	1710	155700	2780	31800	9070	11250	2130	236870
Urban Gatineau	990	1670	1600	13590	470	10390	140	2280	31130
Suburban Ottawa	1780	70	11590	260	35060	680	5430	330	55190
Suburban Gatineau	1030	1040	1380	3730	240	41840	90	3930	53280
Rural Ontario	510	20	3990	10	3900	200	11490	40	20170
Rural Quebec	340	80	220	600	80	2230	50	9750	13350
Total	70030	7860	226170	28690	89940	81870	32670	22640	559880
PM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY DEST RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.49	0.12	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.13
Central Gatineau	0.03	0.18	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.02
Urban Ottawa	0.27	0.16	0.41	0.06	0.18	0.06	0.16	0.04	0.25
Urban Gatineau	0.01	0.16	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.04	0.03
Suburban Ottawa	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.20	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.06
Suburban Gatineau	0.01	0.10	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.08	0.06
Rural Ontario	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.02
Rural Quebec	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.19	0.01
Total	0.86	0.74	0.59	0.64	0.52	0.57	0.48	0.44	0.59
PM PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	7.2%	0.2%	8.5%	0.6%	3.0%	1.9%	0.7%	0.4%	22.5%
Central Gatineau	0.5%	0.3%	0.8%	0.8%	0.3%	1.2%	0.1%	0.3%	4.2%
Urban Ottawa	4.0%	0.3%	27.8%	0.5%	5.7%	1.6%	2.0%	0.4%	42.3%
Urban Gatineau	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	2.4%	0.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.4%	5.6%
Suburban Ottawa	0.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.1%	1.0%	0.1%	9.9%
Suburban Gatineau	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	0.7%	9.5%
Rural Ontario	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	3.6%
Rural Quebec	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.7%	2.4%
Total	12.5%	1.4%	40.4%	5.1%	16.1%	14.6%	5.8%	4.0%	

Table 3-5: PM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 1995

PM PEAK FLOWS	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	42030	1700	65040	4500	14690	10770	3380	2100	144200
Central Gatineau	4170	2540	7080	4580	1630	5520	420	1160	27090
Urban Ottawa	25610	1380	158210	3090	23110	6370	9090	1480	228350
Urban Gatineau	1140	2280	1780	12250	710	6800	190	1950	27100
Suburban Ottawa	1750	50	9480	170	21230	170	3570	150	36580
Suburban Gatineau	1140	860	1730	2520	210	20170	20	1970	28610
Rural Ontario	290	0	2600	0	1510	50	5820	0	10270
Rural Quebec	180	130	530	490	40	870	0	5890	8130
Total	76310	8940	246430	27600	63130	50730	22480	14710	510330
PM PEAK TRIP RATES (BY DEST RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.56	0.15	0.19	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.19
Central Gatineau	0.06	0.23	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.04
Urban Ottawa	0.34	0.12	0.46	0.08	0.21	0.07	0.26	0.04	0.30
Urban Gatineau	0.02	0.20	0.01	0.31	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.05	0.04
Suburban Ottawa	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.05
Suburban Gatineau	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.05	0.04
Rural Ontario	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.01
Rural Quebec	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.01
Total	1.01	0.79	0.71	0.70	0.58	0.52	0.64	0.40	0.68
PM PEAK	Central	Central	Urban	Urban	Suburban	Suburban	Rural	Rural	Total
Central Ottawa	011awa 8 20/	0.2%	12 70/	0.0%	2 004	2 10/	0.7%	Quebee	28.20
Central Gatineau	0.2%	0.5%	12.7%	0.9%	0.3%	2.170	0.1%	0.4%	20.3%
Urban Ottawa	5.0%	0.3%	31.0%	0.9%	4 5%	1.170	1.8%	0.2%	14 7%
Urban Gatineau	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	2.4%	4.5%	1.270	0.0%	0.3%	5 3%
Suburban Ottawa	0.2%	0.4%	1.9%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	7.2%
Suburban Gatineau	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.4%	5.6%
Rural Ontario	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	2.0%
Rural Quebec	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.6%
Total	15.0%	1.8%	48.3%	5.4%	12.4%	9.9%	4.4%	2.9%	

Table 3-6: PM peak period trips between aggregated districts, 1986

As with the AM, PM peak trip rates also show a decrease between 1986 and 1995, although the 1995 and 2005 rates are closer. The PM, as a near-mirror image of the AM, shows the same trend where central and urban Ottawa become less of a focus point for attracting trips in the AM and producing them in the PM, and suburban Ottawa and Gatineau take on a greater role.

Table 3-7: Midday off-peak period trips between aggregated districts, 2005

MIDDAY OFF PEAK	Central	Central	Urban	Urban	Suburban	Suburban	Rural	Rural	
FLOWS	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ottawa	Gatineau	Ontario	Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	70320	1100	44130	1980	9350	3960	2350	910	134100
Central Gatineau	1650	2090	1340	3150	580	2110	20	580	11510
Urban Ottawa	47370	1290	259700	2630	35100	5490	8900	2180	362660
Urban Gatineau	2150	2340	2340	21410	670	10420	160	2910	42400
Suburban Ottawa	10030	420	35140	600	93290	790	8890	560	149710
Suburban Gatineau	3510	1600	4610	10020	850	53940	160	6900	81580
Rural Ontario	2260	60	9440	90	8530	280	15240	140	36030
Rural Quebec	1060	350	1750	2510	360	5530	90	13150	24810
Total	138340	9250	358440	42380	148740	82510	35810	27330	842810
MIDDAY OFF-PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.74	0.01	0.47	0.02	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.01	1.41
Central Gatineau	0.19	0.24	0.15	0.36	0.07	0.24	0.00	0.07	1.32
Urban Ottawa	0.11	0.00	0.61	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.85
Urban Gatineau	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.43	0.01	0.21	0.00	0.06	0.86
Suburban Ottawa	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.57
Suburban Gatineau	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.34	0.00	0.04	0.52
Rural Ontario	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.43
Rural Quebec	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.19	0.36
Total	0.12	0.01	0.31	0.04	0.13	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.73
OFF-PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	8.3%	0.1%	5.2%	0.2%	1.1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	15.9%
Central Gatineau	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	1.4%
Urban Ottawa	5.6%	0.2%	30.8%	0.3%	4.2%	0.7%	1.1%	0.3%	43.0%
Urban Gatineau	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	2.5%	0.1%	1.2%	0.0%	0.3%	5.0%
Suburban Ottawa	1.2%	0.0%	4.2%	0.1%	11.1%	0.1%	1.1%	0.1%	17.8%
Suburban Gatineau	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	1.2%	0.1%	6.4%	0.0%	0.8%	9.7%
Rural Ontario	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	4.3%
Rural Quebec	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.6%	2.9%
Total	16.4%	1.1%	42.5%	5.0%	17.6%	9.8%	4.2%	3.2%	

MIDDAY OFF PEAK FLOWS	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	73400	1780	30330	1740	4750	2630	860	Quebee 670	125150
Central Gatineau	1770	2720	1210	2520	4730	2050	800	270	120150
Urban Ottawa	41450	1020	251210	1870	22210	2000	7220	270	221010
Urban Gatineau	2100	2060	2010	21820	25510	3890	20	1400	27020
Suburban Ottawa	5610	140	2080	21850	46200	240	5750	1400	78660
Suburban Gatineau	2250	2010	20260	6600	40300	56520	110	2020	76000
Bural Ontario	1210	2010	7570	20	5000	50520	18270	3920	22160
Rural Quebec	740	10	200	1400	120	2270	16270	12850	10400
Total	120(10	11040	225720	27200	91120	757(0	20250	20200	714010
Tota	129610	11940	325720	37300	81150	/5/60	32350	20200	/14010
MIDDAY OFF-PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	0.90	0.02	0.48	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.01	1.53
Central Gatineau	0.17	0.35	0.11	0.33	0.02	0.19	0.01	0.03	1.21
Urban Ottawa	0.11	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.86
Urban Gatineau	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.49	0.01	0.16	0.00	0.03	0.85
Suburban Ottawa	0.03	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.46
Suburban Gatineau	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.03	0.52
Rural Ontario	0.02	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.49
Rural Quebec	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.25	0.38
Total	0.14	0.01	0.34	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.75
OFF-PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	10.3%	0.2%	5.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	17.5%
Central Gatineau	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Urban Ottawa	5.8%	0.1%	35.2%	0.3%	3.3%	0.5%	1.0%	0.1%	46.4%
Urban Gatineau	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	3.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.2%	5.3%
Suburban Ottawa	0.8%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	11.0%
Suburban Gatineau	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.5%	10.6%
Rural Ontario	0.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	4.6%
Rural Quebec	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.8%	2.7%
Total	18.2%	1.7%	45.6%	5.2%	11.4%	10.6%	4.5%	2.8%	

Table 3-9: Midda	v off-peak	period trip	s between aggrega	ted districts, 1986

MIDDAY OFF PEAK FLOWS	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	76760	3060	55420	2020	4510	3380	070	550	148460
Central Gatineau	2880	4650	1780	4240	4510	2020	70	200	17200
Urban Ottawa	58220	2000	257250	4240	17620	2030	5020	290	247710
Urban Gatineau	2520	2090	257550	20010	1/020	4340	3920	490	26210
Suburban Ottawa	2670	4550	2010	20010	22660	4700	2620	980	30310
Suburban Gatineau	2220	1650	25.40	5260	23000	200	2030	1590	40020
Bural Ontario	1000	1050	5340	3200	22(0	35210	90	1380	48850
Rural Quebec	740	20	5790	1270	2300	1500	9010	50	18250
Tatal	151120	420	770	12/0	110	1500	10,000	10000	10900
Total	151130	17360	343290	35510	48820	49380	18690	10090	674290
MIDDAY OFF-PEAK TRIP RATES (BY ORIGIN RESIDENTS)	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	1.02	0.05	0.73	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.01	1.97
Central Gatineau	0.34	0.41	0.16	0.38	0.02	0.18	0.01	0.03	1.53
Urban Ottawa	0.17	0.01	0.74	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.00	1.01
Urban Gatineau	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.51	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.03	0.92
Suburban Ottawa	0.03	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.43
Suburban Gatineau	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.02	0.50
Rural Ontario	0.03	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.52
Rural Quebec	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.17	0.30
Total	0.20	0.02	0.46	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.90
OFF-PEAK PERCENTAGES	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Total
Central Ottawa	11.4%	0.6%	8.2%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	22.0%
Central Gatineau	0.6%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
Urban Ottawa	8.6%	0.3%	38.2%	0.2%	2.6%	0.6%	0.9%	0.1%	51.6%
Urban Gatineau	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%	3.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	5.4%
Suburban Ottawa	0.5%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	6.9%
Suburban Gatineau	0.5%	0.2%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	0.2%	7.2%
Rural Ontario	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.7%
Rural Quebec	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%	1.6%
Total	22.4%	2.6%	50.9%	5.3%	7.2%	7.3%	2.8%	1.5%	

In the midday inter-peak period (covering trips that start from 9:00 AM to 3:29 PM) there are more trips overall than in either individual peak, but only by around 20-30%, and the time period is twice as long. As with the peak periods, there is a large drop in trip rate from 1986 to 1995, and a small one from 1995 to 2005. There is also a similar (though not unidirectionally-focused) redistribution of trips towards suburban areas over time.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

3.2 Work trip profiles

Observed trends:

- Distance travelled to work shows no clear variation over time, though there is a slight increase for Ontario and a slight decrease in Québec to reduce the distance between provincial averages
- Non-motorized commutes increase from 7% to 9% of work trips
- For residents of the three central districts and Ottawa West, non-motorized commutes increase from 22% to 30% of work trips

The average distance travelled to get to work by district is indicated in Exhibit 3-2 for 1995 and 2005 (distances for 1986 are unavailable).

The mean distance travelled to work is 9.3 km in 2005 (9.2 km in Ontario and 9.8 km in Québec) compared with 10.0 km in 1995 (8.6 km in Ontario and 10.8 km in Québec), so the difference between provinces is narrowing as well as the trip length decreasing overall. However, if we look just at the urban area as defined in Section 2.2, the mean distance is 8.0 km for both years, suggesting that the change in trip length is confined to rural areas. As work trip lengths are not available for the Rural East and Rural West districts, and these districts could be expected to raise the average trip length, the urban area comparison is likely a more accurate representation of the trend. The apparent variation in the rural south districts should be considered in combination with the understanding that these are small sample sizes due to the low district populations.

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 3-2: Average work trip length, 1995-2005

The following exhibits consider those who travel to work by non-motorized means (walking or cycling). This comparison is separated into two parts, Exhibit 3-3 to Exhibit 3-5 and Exhibit 3-6 to Exhibit 3-8, because of the great difference in percentage of non-motorized travellers between dense urban areas and much more spread out suburban and rural districts.

The overall percentages of people using non-motorized means (walking or cycling) to get to work go from 6.9% in 1986 to 6.4% in 1995 and 8.9% in 2005. For comparison, equivalent percentages in Toronto are 3.0% (1986)¹³, 5.8% (1996)¹⁴ and 6.0% (2006); in Montréal, 7.2% (1996) and 7.5% (2006); in Calgary, 5.5% (1996 and 2006); and in Vancouver, 7.5% (1996) and 8.0% (2006). Thus, none of these other Canadian cities exceed the Ottawa-Gatineau non-motorized commute percentage for 2005.

The average in the four densest districts is 21.9% in 1986, 27.7% in 1995 and 29.5% in 2005.



Exhibit 3-3: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in high-density areas, 2005



Exhibit 3-4: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in high-density areas, 1995

¹⁴ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.44



¹³ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 3-5: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in high-density areas, 1986



Exhibit 3-6: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in suburban and rural areas, 2005



Exhibit 3-7: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in suburban and rural areas, 1995



Exhibit 3-8: Percentage of non-motorized commuters (walk + bike) by place of residence in suburban and rural areas, 1986

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

3.3 Trips by purpose

Observed Trends:

- All purposes of trips increase in number between 1986 and 2005, but work trips do not increase as fast as the population (the other purposes keep a reasonably constant trip rate)
- Work trips decline between 1986 and 1995 from 0.67/capita to 0.48/capita, and then to 0.47/capita by 2005.

Exhibit 3-9 to Exhibit 3-12 show detailed breakdowns of trip purposes across the NCR for peak-period travel. Work and school trips dominate the AM peak, with most trips in the PM peak being to return home (presumably mainly from work and school). While overall there is a slight increase from 1986 to 2005, the trip rates (trips per resident over the age of 10) show a decrease over the same time period, reflecting how the increase in number of (especially) work trips have not kept pace with the increase in number of jobs.



Exhibit 3-9: Trip breakdown by detailed destination purpose (AM peak periods, 1986-2005)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 3-10: Trip rate breakdown by detailed destination purpose (AM peak periods, 1986-2005)



Exhibit 3-11: Trip breakdown by detailed destination purpose (PM peak periods, 1986-2005)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 3-12: Trip rate breakdown by detailed destination purpose (PM peak periods, 1986-2005)

Table 3-10, below, shows how the overall trip rates in the main working-age categories (between 20 and 64) have declined steadily over time (other than the 55-64 category in Québec districts), while other age categories have declined less or increased.

	Age Group	1986	1995	2005
	11-14	2.67	2.90	2.87
	15-19	2.95	3.13	2.98
	20-24	3.28	3.08	2.52
NCR	25-54	3.51	3.36	2.96
	55-64	2.87	2.76	2.70
	65+	2.31	2.07	2.17
	Overall	3.19	3.09	2.79
	11-14	2.75	2.86	2.88
	15-19	3.09	3.14	3.06
	20-24	3.38	3.10	2.54
Ontario	25-54	3.66	3.40	3.02
	55-64	3.08	2.83	2.84
	65+	2.52	2.16	2.28
	Overall	3.33	3.12	2.86
	11-14	2.47	2.94	2.85
	15-19	2.57	3.07	2.73
	20-24	2.95	3.02	2.44
Québec	25-54	3.07	3.18	2.79
	55-64	2.13	2.49	2.35
	65+	1.12	0.82	1.77
	Overall	2.74	2.88	2.60

Table 3-10:	Trip	rates	by	age	group	and	region
	r		~ ,		8- ° - P		

There is an evident decline in the work trip rate post-1986, both in the AM peak (when the bulk of trips to work occur), and over 24 hours, so the decrease is not due to peak-spreading. The decrease is also not due to a proportional reduction in the labour force, as trips per employed worker also decline. However, as seen in

Table 3-11, Toronto (the extended urban area) also shows a decrease, though less pronounced and more linear, since 1986, so the trend is not unique to the NCR. The 2005 NCR trip rates are comparable, though slightly higher, to those found in Toronto in 2006.

NCR	Trips to work		Work trips	oer capita	Work trips per worker		
Year	AM Peak	All day	AM Peak	All day	AM Peak	All day	
1986	288,652	501,882	0.38	0.67	0.71	1.23	
1995	272,367	459,913	0.28	0.48	0.57	0.96	
2005	319,753	542,372	0.28	0.47	0.59	1.00	
Toronto	Trips t	o work	Work trips	er capita Work trips per w		oer worker	
Year	AM Peak	All day	AM Peak	All day	AM Peak	All day	
1986	972,388	1,533,676	0.31	0.49	0.55	0.87	
1996	984,774	1,749,725	0.26	0.46	0.52	0.93	
2006	1,115,023	2,002,219	0.24	0.44	0.49	0.88	

Table 3-11:	Com	parison	of	work	trip	rates.	1986-2006 ¹⁵
	COM	Juiioui	UI.		up	IUUUU	

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the following trends between 1986 and 2005:

- Average trip lengths by district (1995-2005) do not show any significant change, except for possibly in rural areas, where the low overall numbers make it difficult to assess. Work trips are also of similar length between 1995 and 2005.
- While the overall numbers of most types of trips increase, the corresponding trip rates decrease, i.e. the numbers of trips do not grow as fast as the population. This is noticed for all three time periods.
- Work trips decrease from 1986 to 1995, although afterwards they climb again and surpass the 1986 number by 2005.
- There is a decrease over time in trips to and from central and urban areas (in all time periods) in favour of an increase in trips to and from suburban Ottawa and Gatineau.
- There is a small increase in the percentage of non-motorized commuters (7% to 9%) between 1986 and 2005, a trend that is more visible in the four highest density districts (which show a 21% to 29% increase).
- The work trip rate declines abruptly from 1986 to 1995, and then stabilizes (at a level more comparable with other cities) from 1995 to 2005, suggesting a more reliable trend for future extrapolation is the one observed during this later period.



¹⁵ Toronto numbers are taken from the TTS, using the definition of the Greater Toronto urban area described in Section 2.1.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

4. Modal Shares

This chapter, following on from the isolation of trip characteristics such as purposes and times, breaks trips down further into the possible modes that can be used to complete the trip. It looks at different demographic characteristics, such as occupation and possession of a driver's licence, to assess the impact of these on what mode is chosen to travel, as well as how purpose and location influence the choice of mode.

4.1 Mode availability

Observed trends:

- Rate of driver's licence possession remains near-constant by occupation status and location
- The average number of vehicles per worker in a one-person household climbs from 1.1 to 1.6 between 1986 and 2005, a 45% increase. There is a 20% increase for two-person households.

The mode chosen to make trips is to some extent determined by household or personal attributes. Without a driver's licence or an available vehicle, the auto-drive mode is not an option, while possessing a transit pass makes choosing transit very likely. Exhibit 4-1, Exhibit 4-2 and Exhibit 4-3 describe how licence possession varies between occupation groups and years, for the NCR, Ontario and Québec, respectively. Students age 10 or younger are excluded as they are counted differently in each survey.



Exhibit 4-1: NCR driver's licence holders by occupation status, 1986-2005

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-2: Ontario driver's licence holders by occupation status, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-3: Québec driver's licence holders by occupation status, 1986-2005

In Exhibit 4-4, below, the percentages of the population with transit passes are shown for each region and occupation type. These are shown only for 2005 as data are unavailable for earlier years.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-4: Transit pass holders by occupation status, 2005

In Exhibit 4-5, Exhibit 4-6 and Exhibit 4-7, we can see that the number of vehicles per number of workers (car sufficiency) at a household level has increased over time, with similar trends visible for both Ontario and Québec (apart from 5 or more-person households, but there are a comparatively low number of these). In the ensuing series of exhibits (Exhibit 4-8, Exhibit 4-9 and Exhibit 4-10), the percentage changes are shown directly to indicate the effect of time and there we see that, with the cited exception of large households in Québec, all the trends are positive over time. The changes are much more prominent from 1995 to 2005 than from 1986 to 1995, despite there being only one additional year in the later period, and are especially noted for one-person households (note that the ratios are aggregated over all households of the same size, and many one-person households will have a car but no workers).



Exhibit 4-5: NCR vehicle sufficiency per worker, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-6: Ontario vehicle sufficiency per worker, 1986-2005


Exhibit 4-7: Québec vehicle sufficiency per worker, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-8: NCR change in vehicle sufficiency per worker by district, 1986-2005





Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-10: Québec change in vehicle sufficiency per worker by district, 1986-2005

4.2 Mode choice overview

Observed trends:

- Transit mode share from 1986 to 2005 decreases from 18% to 15%, although the 1995 to 2005 trend is positive (13% to 15%) and there is an increase in Gatineau
- Walk mode share increases from 7% to 11%.
- Auto mode share remains almost the same
- Overall numbers of trips increase by similar percentages in all three time periods

A general look at mode shares and how they are affected by the purpose of the trip in the NCR is presented in Exhibit 4-11 to Exhibit 4-15, with influence of time period instead of purpose shown subsequently in Exhibit 4-16 and Exhibit 4-17. Trip purposes are displayed separately for clarity.

In the 1986 survey, school buses were included in a bus category, so in the comparisons with other years done below they are included with transit. However, this only affects school and return home trips. "Other" trips include shopping, leisure and medical trips, as well as any that do not fall into any of the other described categories.

There is a marked increase in auto drive trips for work and return-home purposes between 1995 and 2005, but this only maintains the auto mode share due to the overall greater number of trips, while the transit mode share increases despite this being less evident from the absolute numbers of trips. Non-motorized, auto passenger and other modes show smaller increases, although there is no mode that decreases in absolute number of trips between 1995 and 2005. 1986 appears to have a greater overall number of transit trips (remembering that this is including school buses) than 1995 with 397,000 compared with 321,000 in 1995, but the numbers increase again to 434,000 in 2005. Transit mode share decreases from 18% to 13% before recovering to 15%. The difference

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

is mainly assumed by walk trips, which increase from 7% in 1986 to 11% in the later years.

The overall number of work trips goes from 502,000 in 1986 to 542,000 in 2005. This, an increase of 8.0%, is comparable with the increases in Toronto from 1986 to 2006 ($6.4\%^{16}$) or in Montréal from 1987 to 2008 ($8.5\%^{17}$).



Exhibit 4-11: Work trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-12: School trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005

¹⁶ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

¹⁷ Secrétariat aux enquêtes Origine-Destination métropolitaines, Enquête Origine-Destination 2008 Faits Saillants, Agence métropolitaine de transport, 2008, p.19



Exhibit 4-13: Serve passenger trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-14: Return home trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-15: Other trip breakdown by mode, 1986-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



In Exhibit 4-16, below, the total number of trips increases for all time periods, by a consistent amount for each, thus maintaining a similar daily time profile.

Exhibit 4-16: Trip breakdown by time of day, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-17: Trip breakdown by mode and time period, 1986-2005

Examining the modes in detail as shown above (Exhibit 4-17) shows that we have in effect four modes (auto-drive, auto passenger, public transit/ school bus and walking),



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

with others having minimal influence. The distribution between times of day by mode does not show any major variations from 1986 to 2005.

The mode shares for each of the three time periods are shown directly from Exhibit 4-18 to Exhibit 4-26. It should be noted that in 1986, school bus numbers are included as part of public transit, which is why the school bus share is shown as 0% for this year. However, there is still a markedly larger transit share for 1986 than for the other years, even when this is taken into account, for all time periods.

The overall transit mode share is 18% for 1986, 13% for 1995 and 15% for 2005. A decrease for a similar timeframe was also noticed in Montréal (25% in 1987 to 21% in 2008)¹⁸ and in Toronto (25% in 1986 to 19% in 2006)¹⁹. Calgary (9% in 1996, 8% in 2006)²⁰ and Vancouver (11% in 1996, 10% in 2006) also have shown decreases over a more recent span. Meanwhile, the non-motorized mode share has climbed in the NCR from 8% in 1986 to 12% in 2005, and this trend is also seen in other cities, including Calgary (11% to 16% from 1996 to 2006), and Vancouver (12% to 13% from 1996 to 2006). However, Montréal (13% to 11% from 1987 to 2008) and Toronto (10% to 9% from 1986 to 2006) do not follow the same pattern.



Exhibit 4-18: 2005 mode share (AM peak period)

¹⁸ Secrétariat aux enquêtes Origine-Destination métropolitaines, Enquête Origine-Destination 2008 Faits Saillants, Agence métropolitaine de transport, 2008, p.20

¹⁹ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

²⁰ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.33

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-19: 1995 mode share (AM peak period)



Exhibit 4-20: 1986 mode share (AM peak period)



Exhibit 4-21: 2005 mode share (PM peak period)



Exhibit 4-22: 1995 mode share (PM peak period)

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-23: 1986 mode share (PM peak period)



Exhibit 4-24: 2005 mode share (midday off-peak period)

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-25: 1995 mode share (midday off-peak period)



Exhibit 4-26: 1986 mode share (midday off-peak period)

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



The following series of exhibits present the varying influence of occupation status on mode choice over time, both in absolute numbers of trips and overall percentages of trips.





Exhibit 4-28: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages), 2005



Exhibit 4-29: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (absolute numbers), 1995





Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-31: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (absolute numbers), 1986



Exhibit 4-32: Trip breakdown by mode and occupation status (percentages), 1986

We can see from Exhibit 4-33, below, that there is an increasing trend in the percentage of driver's licence holders who opt to drive, up from 57% in 1986 to 63% in 2005. However, the number of licensed drivers who opt to take transit also increases, at least from 1995 to 2005. The number of overall trip-makers without licences varies from 16% of trips in 1986 to 19% in 1995 and 10% in 2005 (this does not include trips made by people under 11 years of age). Transit pass holder relationships were also reported in Part 1, but these data are not available for the earlier years.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-33: Trip breakdown by mode and licence status, 1986-2005

Exhibit 4-34, below, illustrates the number of daily trips made per resident of the NCR, by mode. As before, an overall decline in trip rate for motorized modes can be seen, possibly in connection with the decrease in the percentage of full-time workers.



Exhibit 4-34: Modal trip rate trends by licence status, 1986-2005

From Exhibit 4-35, it can be seen that there is a notable increase in male auto passenger mode share in 1995 at the expense of drive mode share, but the 1986 pattern is resumed in 2005. Other modes are relatively constant.



National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-35: Trip breakdown by mode and gender, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-36: Male auto driver mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-37: Male auto passenger mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-38: Male transit / school bus mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-39: Male non-motorized mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-40: Male 'other' mode share by age group, 1986-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-41: Female auto driver mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-42: Female auto passenger mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-43: Female transit / school bus mode share by age group, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-44: Female non-motorized mode share by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-45: Female 'other' mode share by age group, 1986-2005

From the above exhibits we can note an increase in the auto drive mode share for women 25 and over, while auto passenger and transit show a corresponding decline. Meanwhile, the male auto drive mode share for men 25 and over has remained essentially the same, meaning that the difference between the genders is narrowing in this regard.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

4.3 Mode choice by location

Observed trends:

- For trips to and from the Ottawa CBD, the auto drive mode share was higher than the transit mode share in 1995, but lower in 1986 and 2005.
- The auto mode share has generally increased to over 50%, while transit mode share has decreased to below 25% for trips that end in Ontario. Transit within Gatineau; however, shows indications of an increased share.

The following charts, from Exhibit 4-46 to Exhibit 4-50, describe the variation of mode share over time. The drop in transit (and school bus) mode share from 1986 to 1995, while drive and passenger shares increase, is particularly noticeable in Ontario, where the transit mode shares are higher initially than in Québec. In 1986 there is a noticeable difference between origin transit mode shares in Ontario (31%) and Québec (23%), with destinations (30% and 27%) much more similar, but by 2005 transit mode share in Ontario by origin has decreased to 27% while the Québec equivalent has risen to 25%. Québec transit shares do decrease between 1986 and 1995, which may be partly due to the removal of provincial public transportation funding in Québec in 1992. The differences between origin and destination mode shares are now minimal for the AM peak period for both Ontario and Québec districts.



Exhibit 4-46: AM peak period mode shares (NCR), 1986-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-47: AM peak period origin mode shares (Ontario), 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-48: AM peak period origin mode shares (Québec), 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-49: AM peak period destination mode shares (Ontario), 1986-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-50: AM peak period destination mode shares (Québec), 1986-2005

For AM peak period trips originating in or destined to the high-density CBD (Ottawa Centre), as shown in Exhibit 4-51, auto drive and public transit have similar shares. Transit, with a mode share of 40%, exceeds the 35% share of driving in 2006. This is a reversal of the situation in 1995, though it is a lower number than the 45% transit share of 1986. Walking is in third place in 2006 with 13%, up from 7% in 1986 (non-motorized in total is 15% if cycling is included). Auto passenger, at 8%, has decreased from 12% in the earlier years.

Comparing with other cities between 1996 and 2006²¹, transit mode shares to the Ottawa CBD (39% and 43%) are not dissimilar to those to other CBDs, such as Vancouver (38% and 30%), Toronto (47% and 52%) and Montréal (50% and 47%). The non-motorized mode share to Ottawa (12% and 13%) exceeds Toronto (5% and 8%) and Montréal (7% and 12%) although there appears to have been a huge increase in Vancouver over the same time (7% to 25%).



²¹ Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.35

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-51: AM peak period origin + destination mode shares (Ottawa Centre), 1986-2005

In the following charts (Exhibit 4-52 and Exhibit 4-53), we expand on the trip flow data presented in Section 3.1 to see how the AM mode share varies by origin and destination district type. Here, the modes are aggregated so that "auto" includes drive, passenger, taxi, motorcycle and 'other,' "non-motor" includes walk and cycle, and "transit" includes public transit. For this comparison, the school bus mode is omitted (so 1986 must be left out as it does not distinguish school bus from public transit) as it would make an auto against transit comparison difficult, especially in rural areas where there are considerably more school bus users than public transit users.

From these charts, we notice an increase in transit and non-motorized mode shares originating in urban and central areas in both Ottawa and Gatineau, and a corresponding decrease in auto mode shares. The same can be seen for destinations except for urban and suburban Ottawa districts, which retain almost the same mode shares. For work trips (Exhibit 4-54), transit mode share specifically for work trips is similar in 1986 and 2005 for Ontario residents (with a drop in 1995) while it has increased for Québec residents so that now both Ottawa and Gatineau have similar work transit mode shares for similar district types. These are in the 16%-21%, apart from in rural areas where transit service can be expected to be lower.



Exhibit 4-52: AM peak period origin mode shares by district type, 1995-2005



Exhibit 4-53: AM peak period destination mode shares by district type, 1995-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 4-54: Transit work trip mode share by district type, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

4.4 Ridesharing patterns

Observed trends:

- Average auto occupancy decreases for three-person, one-vehicle households from 1.5 to 1.4
- Small decreases are also noted in the average PM peak and off-peak auto occupancies, the AM peak is less affected

The following analysis investigates how the popularity of ridesharing, i.e., the popularity of the auto passenger mode, is influenced by geographic, personal and household attributes, as well as the types of trips that are being made by auto passengers.

Exhibit 4-55 tabulates the auto passenger share for all trips by district of residence and survey year. The exhibit shows that over most of the districts the mode share taken up by auto passengers, indicating the amount of ridesharing that occurs, is relatively constant between 10% and 15%. There are, however, some rural areas where there has been a large decrease over time, from more than 20% down to the more usual 10-15%, but in these cases the overall number of trips is not very high, which may account for greater fluctuations. Gatineau Centre and the Rural Northwest show a substantial increase from 5% to 15% (Gatineau Centre goes from being the district with the lowest percentage in 1986 to having the highest in 2005). In summary, the auto passenger mode percentage fluctuates greatly among the districts in 1986, but by 2005 has become much less variable.

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 4-55: Choice of auto passenger mode by geographic location of residence, 1986-2005

The next three charts (Exhibit 4-56 to Exhibit 4-58) indicate for the NCR and its Ontario and Québec parts how the increasing number of vehicles per household member influences vehicle occupancy. There are no significant differences between the survey years (numbers for four-person one-vehicle households are low which may explain the fluctuation there), apart from a slight drop in occupancy in Ontario for three-person households, which is not reflected in Québec.



Exhibit 4-56: Ridesharing patterns by household size (NCR), 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-57: Ridesharing patterns by household size (Ontario), 1986-2005



Exhibit 4-58: Ridesharing patterns by household size (Québec), 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Exhibit 4-59 compares ridesharing statistics, in the form of auto occupancy estimates, over the course of the day. Based on a comparison of occupancies between years (1986 occupancies are not available) there appears to be a slight trend towards lower auto occupancy from 1995 to 2005, as this is reflected in all time periods, although less in the AM peak than later on in the day. The off-peak has fewer school trips, which may help to explain the lower overall average occupancy.



Exhibit 4-59: Ridesharing patterns by time period, 1995-2005

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the following trends between 1986 and 2005:

- Many characteristics, such as properties of driver's licence holders, and auto occupancy/ridesharing patterns, remain essentially unchanged;
- The number of household vehicles per worker has increased for all household sizes, but especially for one-person households (by 50%) and two-person households (by 20%);
- Transit mode share has decreased over time (a pattern also noticed in other Canadian cities) from 18% to 15%, though as it was 13% in 1995, the latest trend shows an increase. Meanwhile, the walk mode share has increased from 7% to 11%, and the auto share has virtually stayed the same;
- The overall drop in transit from 1986 to 1995 can be noticed especially in trips destined to Ontario districts, but there is a recovery post-1995, especially in Gatineau;
- An increase in transit and non-motorized travel has occurred primarily in central and urban districts, except for trips destined to urban Ottawa. Over time, Gatineau has almost caught up to Ottawa in terms of non-auto mode share for similar district types, and in transit work trip mode share.



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

5. Public Transit

This chapter focuses more closely on the specifics of transit users; their age range, gender balance, household characteristics and why they use transit, in order to understand some of the motivating factors behind transit use in the NCR over time.

5.1 Demographic characteristics of transit users

Observed trends:

- There is a proportional increase in transit use in the 25-54 age group in 1995, resulting in over 50% of all transit users falling into this category. However, transit use reverts back to the previous proportion in 2005, driven by a decrease in Ontario.
- The proportion of transit users in the 15-24 age categories increases over time in Ontario and overall, but decreases in Québec.

The following charts, Exhibit 5-1 to Exhibit 5-3, indicate how the overall transit mode share (15% in 1986, 10% in 1995 and 13% in 2005) is distributed amongst age groups.



Exhibit 5-1: NCR transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-2: Ontario transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 5-3: Québec transit user percentages by age group, 1986-2005

Exhibit 5-4 to Exhibit 5-6 show, for each age group, how transit mode share split by gender varies across the years. The female transit share remains consistently above the male share over time. A general trend for the female share to increase with age is particularly noticeable in 1995 and for Gatineau.



Exhibit 5-4: NCR transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-5: Ontario transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 5-6: Québec transit mode share by gender, 1986-2005

5.2 Household characteristics of transit users

Observed trends:

- The transit mode share in 0-vehicle households has decreased from 58% in 1986 to 44% in 2005, though it has increased from 38% in 1995.
- The transit mode share in multiple-worker households is consistently marginally lower than that for one-worker households, a comparison that does not vary between the years.

As seen in Exhibit 5-7, transit mode share is very slightly lower for households with multiple workers than for one-worker households. This tendency is the same for all years.



Exhibit 5-7: Transit mode share by household number of workers, 1986-2005

Living in a no-vehicle household makes it much more likely that a person will take transit, as the mode share is much higher for these households, as shown in Exhibit 5-8,

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



but this percentage has decreased to some degree over time, from 50%-60% in 1985 to 40% -45% in 2005.

Exhibit 5-8: Transit mode share by household number of vehicles, 1986-2005

Exhibit 5-9 shows a similar pattern for each number of workers per household for each region, with a decrease in transit mode share with the corresponding increase in number of household vehicles, reflected across all years. There appears to be a substantial jump in transit share for zero-vehicle households between 3 workers and more than 3 workers for 1995 and 2005 (but not 1986, or in Québec), but we should note that this applies to a very low sample size, hence the variability.



Exhibit 5-9: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (NCR), 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 5-10: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (Ontario), 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-11: Transit mode share by worker/vehicle sufficiency (Québec), 1986-2005

The charts from Exhibit 5-12 to Exhibit 5-14 cross-compare the variation in transit trips with household workers and available vehicles. The highest numbers of transit trips are made by people from 2-worker, 1-vehicle households, a number that is almost the same in 1986 and 2005, despite an intervening year drop. However, there are almost as many transit trips taken by people from one-vehicle, one-worker households.

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 5-12: NCR transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-13: Ontario transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-14: Québec transit trip trends by vehicle availability, 1986-2005

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

5.3 Transit trip purposes

Observed trends:

- Transit mode share declines almost equally (by around 4%) across all purposes between 1986 and 2005
- Since 1995, mode share has been rebounding, particularly for work and school trips
- Mode share lost between 1986 and 1995 for non work or non-school trips does not appear to be recovering to the same extent as work and school trips

Exhibit 5-15, below, focuses in on the areas that were shaded for transit in Exhibit 5-4, indicating what actual percentage of each purpose corresponds to transit trips, and how this varies over the years (so, for example, almost 20% of trips to work are made by transit in 1986, dropping to 14% in 1995). Exhibit 5-16 and Exhibit 5-17 show the percentage changes from 1986, in absolute (mode share percentage point change) and relative (change in mode share / old mode share) terms. Compared with 1986, all purposes have a decreased mode share in 2005, although all also increase from 1995 to 2005, indicating a possible ongoing upward trend.



Exhibit 5-15: Transit mode share by trip purpose, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-16: Absolute (percentage point) change in transit shares by purpose, 1986-2005





Exhibit 5-17: Relative change in transit shares by purpose, 1986-2005


Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

5.4 Transit trips to work

Observed trends:

- Transit work trip mode share variation follows a repeated pattern (decline followed by partial recovery) that appears independent of household or age properties, or age group
- As South Nepean increases its employment density to more than 100 jobs per square km, transit mode share increases from 5% to 14%. Similarly Beacon Hill, Hull Périphérie and Kanata/Stittsville, all with large increases in employment density, double or more than double their transit mode share.

The following series of exhibits display the variation over time of the transit mode share to work. The usual pattern indicates a drop of around 5% from 1986 to 1995, and then a recovery of most of the mode share by 2005. Exceptions to this, other than in cases with very low samples (such as the non-working age categories, are noticed in Québec where in many cases the transit mode share in 2005 exceeds that in 1986.

Overall, the transit mode share to work (as was seen in Exhibit 5-15) is 20% in 1986, 14% in 1995 and 16% in 2005. This is lower than Montréal, Vancouver, and Toronto, all of which are 22% in both 1996 and 2006, though similar to Calgary (13% in 1996 and 16% in 2006)²².



Exhibit 5-18: NCR work trip transit mode share by household size, 1986-2005

²² Transportation Association of Canada, Urban Transportation Indicators Fourth Survey Final Report, TAC, December 2009, p.44



Exhibit 5-19: NCR work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-20: NCR work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-21: Ontario work trip transit mode share by household size, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-22: Ontario work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-23: Ontario work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-24: Québec work trip transit mode share by household size, 1986-2005

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 5-25: Québec work trip transit mode share by vehicle availability, 1986-2005



Exhibit 5-26: Québec work trip transit mode share by age, 1986-2005

The next chart, Exhibit 5-27, compares the employment density of each district with the transit mode share of trips made by people who work in the district (in the AM peak period). We can note for most suburban districts that undergo density growth, such as Orléans, Aylmer, Gatineau Est and South Nepean, and for the urban district of Hull Périphérie, there is a corresponding increase in transit mode share over time, although this does not apply for the urban district of Merivale, where transit mode share remains similar despite density growth.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 5-27: Transit mode share by employment density, 1986-2005

The AM peak transit ridership, overall, decreases from 0.17 transit trips per capita in 1986 to 0.12 transit trips per capita in 2005 (with 0.11 in 1995). However, Toronto and Montréal also show decreases over this time, with Montréal going from 0.14 transit trips per capita in 1987 to 0.12 in 2008²³, and Toronto going from 0.13 transit trips per capita in 1986 to 0.09 in 2006²⁴.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the following trends for transit between 1986 and 2005:

- The gender split is consistent through the years, with the female share on transit greater than the male for age categories 25 and over;
- The transit mode share variation by number of household vehicles is consistent across the years;
- All purposes (work, school, return home and other) decrease their transit mode share between 1986 and 2005 by 3.5% to 4.5%;

²³ Secrétariat aux enquêtes Origine-Destination métropolitaines, Enquête Origine-Destination 2008 Faits Saillants, Agence métropolitaine de transport, 2008, p.22

²⁴ University of Toronto Data Management Group, Transportation Tomorrow Survey data, 1986-2006.

- Transit mode share to work decreases from 20% to 15% between 1986 and 1995, but increases to 16% by 2005;
- The number of transit trips per capita in the AM peak drops from 0.17 to 0.12 between 1986 and 2005, in line with the trends noticed in other large Canadian cities;
- There is an increase in transit mode share in Ottawa and Gatineau suburban areas from 1995 to 2005, in parallel to density growth in those areas, though the correlation is less well defined for urban areas.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

6. Identification of Trends

From the survey analyses we can identify the following major demographic and tripmaking trends within the National Capital Region between 1986 and 2005:

6.1 Demographic patterns

The fastest growing residential areas are the suburban and rural districts, while in the central areas population has increased only slightly in 20 years (population has more than doubled outside the Ottawa greenbelt, but increased by only 20% inside it). Additionally, the areas where jobs are concentrated (in the Ontario part of the NCR) have spread out over time, as the percentage of jobs located in central Ottawa has decreased from 39% to 31%. Jobs in suburban areas have increased markedly, such as in Kanata/Stittsville, which had two resident workers for every job in 1986, but more jobs than workers in 2005, despite a large increase in population. Accompanying this widening of the employment area are changes in the commuting patterns with some districts retaining a much larger percentage of their resident workforce to work in that district than others.

6.2 Transit, ridesharing and non-motorized mode share

From 1986 to 2005, transit mode share shows an overall decrease from 18% to 15%, though more recently it increases from 13% in 1995. There is also a drop in transit trips per capita, with a decrease for trips in the AM peak of 0.17 to 0.12 between 1986 and 2005. Decreases are seen to be reasonably consistent (percentagewise) across all purposes. However, transit mode share does not decrease for any individual district type, the drop in overall mode share results instead from a large proportion of trips shifting to district types with lower transit usage. Meanwhile, non-motorized travel has increased (changing from 8% to 12% of all trips) over the whole NCR, but the increase only applies to central districts, which already had a significant non-motorized share. Non-motorized commuting in the four densest (central) districts increases from a 21% mode share to 29%. The drop in transit use can be most noticed for trips that finish in Ontario (not necessarily interprovincial trips, though), and it does not apply to trips starting in Gatineau, which have grown in number over time. Vehicle occupancy patterns are largely unchanged, as is the overall auto mode share.

6.3 Gender balance

Over time the female percentage of the work force in the NCR increases from 40% in 1986 to nearly 46% in 2005, significantly increasing the evenness of the distribution. Female participation in the workforce is growing faster in Gatineau than in Ottawa. The mode distribution does not change notably over time, with the female transit share remaining consistently higher for both Ottawa and Gatineau, though there is a large increase in the auto driver mode share for women, particularly those over the age of 55.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

6.4 Trip distribution patterns

Work trips decrease from 1986 to 1995, but then increase to the highest level of the three by 2005. Work trip rates decrease notably from 1986 to 1995, but then stabilize at around 0.28 work trips per capita (0.58 per worker) in each AM peak period. There is no discernible change in average trip lengths (for work trips or for all trips) between 1995 and 2005 (with data not available for 1986), but there are changes in trip patterns as the proportion of trips to and from suburban districts increases. In 1986, 85% of AM peak trips in the NCR were destined to one of the central or urban districts. By 2005, this proportion had dropped to 72%.

6.5 Time of day variation

The daily profile remains similar from 1986 to 2005, with an increase in trips but decrease in trip rates noted for all three time periods. Trips are growing at a similar rate in all time periods, as off-peak trips increased by 25% from 1986 to 2005, while the AM and PM peaks grew by 28% and 27%, respectively.

6.6 Impact of urban density

Urban density was only considered for the 1995 to 2005 period, due to the unavailability of Québec employment data for 1986, but within this time there has been an increase in suburban area density alongside an increase in transit mode share. Since 1995, Ottawa density has been increasing slightly faster than that of Gatineau, but the rates are quite similar. As the number of jobs (and, the corresponding employment density) has increased in Orléans, Hull Périphérie, Gatineau Est, Aylmer and South Nepean, so has the percentage of transit trips. Looking at the NCR as a whole, with the growth of suburban areas the number of vehicles per household and percentage of households inhabiting detached housing have also increased from 1986 to 2005.

6.7 Major trends

Based on these conclusions, we can identify the following significant trends:

- Shift of both population and employment to suburbs and less dense areas;
- Adjustment in gender-based workforce and mode share distribution;
- Decrease in trip rates per capita (especially for work trips);
- Increase in suburban transit mode share and CBD non-motorized mode share.

The following chapter will extrapolate these to 2031, using both the 1986-2005 and 1995-2005 trends where available, and examine them in closer detail.



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

7. Extrapolation of Trends

The following significant trends were identified by analysing survey results from 1986 to 2005, as has been described in the preceding chapters. In this chapter, forming Part 3 of our study, we extrapolate to 2031 to suggest the impacts of continuing the trends. In the exhibits that follow, a continuation of the 1986-2005 trend is shown in blue, and a continuation of the 1995-2005 trend is shown in red. The space between them as they diverge over time represents a range of possibility for the value of the indicator in a particular year. Thus, we take into account all the details provided by the surveys.

These extrapolations are intended to show where trends are heading, not to provide detailed projections such as are carried out by the TRANS model, nor to critique methods used to develop existing model inputs or the current model structure. However, they can be used to confirm directionality of model projections, and so comparisons with selected model results are also included. It also is important to note that, in accordance with the mandate of this project, the extrapolation that follows is intended to provide insight as to how the future development of the TRANS model or of inputs might be complemented or enhanced.

Trends are extrapolated linearly—for the purposes of this analysis changes in proportions are assumed to be constant over time, although overall population and employment numbers are assumed to grow in accordance with the growth rates seen over the past 10 or 19 years. As will be seen, the realization of these extrapolations would result, in a few cases, in extreme and clearly unrealistic situations: it is essential to keep in mind that the purpose of these extrapolations is to indicate the direction in which the trends are pointing. It is clear that, in actuality, several unforeseen events could influence extrapolated outcomes over the next 20+ years.

7.1 Shift to suburbs

A shift (in both residents and jobs) is occurring from central and urban districts towards suburban and less dense areas. This may lead to changes (as described below) in demographic properties and travel behaviour, as suburban trips increase faster than radial trips to and from the central areas. In terms of future model development, as TRANS considers its next generation of models, these changes may require adjustments to modelling parameters, or expansion of the modelling focus to consider suburban trips, to deal with the implications of these trends. Models focused only on forecasting trips to and from city centres will not capture the whole picture in light of these evolving trends.

7.1.1 Suburban residential growth proportionate to centre

In 1986, 63% of NCR residents lived in central or urban districts, but in 2005 only 50% did. The population of suburban and rural areas more than doubled while that of central and urban areas increased by a comparatively low 23%. This trend of increasing suburban growth, if continued, will lead to two-thirds of NCR residents living in suburban and

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

rural districts by 2031. The comparable number from the TRANS model is 57%, indicating a shift in the same direction.

From 1986 to 2005, there has been a progressive shift of population from urban areas to suburban and rural areas, although the shift is steeper between 1986 and 1995. For the NCR as a whole, the suburban/rural proportion of residents approaches 50% between 2005 and 2010 (Exhibit 7-1), and for just the Ontario districts, it approaches 50% in the vicinity of 2021 (Exhibit 7-2). In Gatineau, where there are fewer central and urban districts, the majority of residents have lived in suburban and rural areas since 1986 (Exhibit 7-3), and the urban and suburban trends appear to continue to diverge. These proportions are assuming that districts keep their definitions over time—i.e., that a suburban district does not become redefined as an urban one owing to an increase in density.



Exhibit 7-1: Urban-suburban resident trend (NCR)



Exhibit 7-2: Urban-suburban resident trend (Ontario)

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-3: Urban-suburban resident trend (Québec)

7.1.2 Suburban employment growth proportionate to centre

In 1986, 92% of jobs were located in central or urban districts, but by 2005 this proportion had dropped to 79%. At this rate of decrease, less than two-thirds of jobs will be in the central or urban areas by 2031. Between 1995 and 2005 the number of jobs in central Ottawa still increased by 22,700, but this 14% increase is much lower than the 22% increase in jobs in Ottawa as a whole. Jobs in central Gatineau decreased by 1,200, a 5% decline compared with a 17% increase for all of Gatineau.

The next series of exhibits show the same patterns for jobs as were previously shown for residents. For Ontario districts (Exhibit 7-5), trends are shown based on both the 1986-2005 and 1995-2005 changes, as 1986 job data are available, but for the NCR and Québec exhibits (Exhibit 7-4 and Exhibit 7-5), only the 1995-2005 trend is used as 1986 jobs are not available for Québec. However, we can see from Exhibit 7-5 that the 1986-2005 and 1995-2005 rates of convergence of central/urban and suburban/rural jobs are very similar, as the trend lines are almost overlaid. Overall, the movement of jobs away from central and urban areas is slower than the corresponding movement of residents, but it is still noticeable, especially in Ontario where almost a third of jobs may be in suburban or rural areas by 2031. In the Gatineau districts, only two of which are central or urban, the situation is different, as suburban and rural jobs already represent a majority and their proportion is actually declining very slightly over time. Forecasts from the TRANS model indicate that 68% of jobs will be in central and urban areas in 2031, which is consistent with the survey-based findings.





Exhibit 7-4: Urban-suburban employment trend (NCR)



Exhibit 7-5: Urban-suburban employment trend (Ontario)



Exhibit 7-6: Urban-suburban employment trend (Québec)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

7.1.3 Variation in commute patterns

The proportion of people travelling in the AM peak to suburban and rural areas has increased from 15% in 1986 to 28% in 2005, a trend that, if continued, would see over 40% of AM peak trips made to the suburban and rural districts by 2031. Meanwhile, half of all AM peak trips originate in the suburban or rural districts in 2005, up from 35% in 1986. This has implications for mode share calculations, as suburban and rural trips need to be given more attention. One implication is that, in future model development, TRANS may need to develop mode share functions that apply separately to trips destined to the downtowns; to elsewhere on the rapid transit system; to suburban town centres (key nodes); and to the suburbs generally.

Exhibit 7-7 to Exhibit 7-10 show the anticipated change in the distribution of peak-period trips between suburban/rural and central/urban areas. As could be expected, these are similar in appearance to the population and employment trends. Only the AM peak period is shown (the PM peak features what is largely a reverse of the AM trip flows, as was seen in Section 3.1), and the 1986-2005 and 1995-2005 trends are very similar.

In Ottawa, suburban and rural areas are attracting an increasingly higher proportion of AM peak trips, to the extent that if the present trend continues their proportion will reach 40% by 2031. The TRANS model produces similar results, with 36% of AM peak trips destined to suburban and rural districts in 2031. Suburban and rural districts already represent more than half of the AM peak destinations in Gatineau, and the suburban/rural proportion appears to be increasing at a similar rate. If trends continue, more than half of AM peak trips will begin in suburban and rural areas in the Ontario districts by 2021. In the Québec districts, where suburban and rural areas already form the great majority of origin points, the growth is slower as there is less room for expansion.



Exhibit 7-7: AM peak trips to suburban/rural areas (Ontario)

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study



Exhibit 7-8: AM peak trips to suburban/rural areas (Québec)



Exhibit 7-9: AM peak trips from suburban/rural areas (Ontario)



Exhibit 7-10: AM peak trips from suburban/rural areas (Québec)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

Exhibit 7-11 shows a predicted gradual decline in the proportion of AM peak trips headed to the CBDs of Ottawa (Ottawa Centre) and Gatineau (Île de Hull). The 1986-2005 and 1995-2005 trends are reasonably similar, leading to there not being much variation in the decrease. By 2031, the trend indicates that 10% or fewer of AM peak-period trips will be to downtown cores.



Exhibit 7-11: AM Peak trip proportions to CBD (Ottawa Centre and Île de Hull)

7.1.4 Increase in vehicles per household

Between 1986 and 2005 the average number of household vehicles has increased from 1.33 to 1.41 (or from 1.27 to 1.41 between 1995 and 2005). Gatineau has grown slightly faster than Ottawa over this time. Based on the slower 1986-2005 growth rates, a continuing trend would see 1.53 vehicles per household by 2031 (1.47 in Ontario and 1.74 in Québec), which should be noted for forecasting auto ownership, which influences mode share at the household level.

In contrast, the TRANS model predicts a decline to 1.38 vehicles per household by 2031. However, survey trends indicate a difficulty in establishing a long-term pattern—after a decrease from 1986 to 1995, the average number of vehicles in a household has increased pronouncedly from 1995 to 2005, with a slightly faster increase in the less dense Gatineau districts compared with the Ottawa districts. This means that, depending on whether the short-term (1995-2005) or long-term (1986-2005, with the drop and subsequent recovery) trend is extrapolated, there is a large variation in the future number of vehicles per household, which could remain in the 1.4 to 1.6 range or climb towards 1.9, as seen in Exhibit 7-12. In summary, it is a difficult trend to project; nonetheless, the general upward trend still contrasts with the downward trend predicted by the model.

TRANS Committee

National Capital Region Travel Trend Study

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-12: Average vehicles per household

While the average number of vehicles per household has increased, the percentage of zero-car households has decreased from 16% in 1995 to 12% in 2005, which is consistent with the fact that the central districts are comprised of 35 to 40% zero-car households, and the proportion of residents living in these areas is decreasing (12.9% of NCR households were in the central districts in 1995, but only 11.5% in 2005). Additionally, with most new jobs not being located downtown, those who do live downtown are more likely to have to commute out of the central districts, a travel pattern that may not be recognized well by transit models that are calibrated according to today's focus on work trips *to* the downtown areas. In a related finding, the average number of vehicles per worker, which indicates the level of accessibility people have to vehicles for work trips, also increases from 1.00 (Ottawa) and 1.02 (Gatineau) in 1986 to 1.20 (Ottawa) and 1.24 (Gatineau) in 2005.

As seen in Exhibit 7-13, the proportion of households without a car is decreasing in both Ottawa and Gatineau, especially steeply if the 1995-2005 trend is followed. The 1986-2005 trend looks more reasonable, as otherwise there will be virtually no zero-car households by 2031. This trend is based only on the change in proportions over recent years though, and does not take into account the implications of future actions such as improved suburban transit service, transit-oriented development and higher densities.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-13: Proportion of zero-car households

7.1.5 Increase in proportion of residents living in detached housing

The percentage of NCR residents in detached housing climbs from 48% in 1986 to 55% in 2005. Were this trend to continue it would reach 64% by 2031 (a proportion similar to that of comparable US cities *today*). The TRANS model also predicts an (even faster) increase, to 69% by 2031. This is likely connected to the trend of faster population increases in less dense areas, and the growth in number of cars per household, which if it continues is likely to reduce the probability of choosing transit. Ottawa (historically having a lower percentage of its inhabitants living in detached houses) is showing signs that it will equal Gatineau at around the 65% mark by 2031.



Exhibit 7-14: Proportion of detached-house households

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

7.2 Gender balance

Gender balance varies over the years between surveys, both in terms of work force participation and mode share distribution, as women's trip-making patterns come to resemble more closely those of men. This may require the adjustment of separate trip rates for trip forecasting over the long term, as overall the percentage of all trips (by those above the age of 10) made by females increases from 49.2% in 1986 to 50.7% in 2005. The overall trip rate per resident above the age of 10 is 11% higher for males than females in 1986, but only 4% higher in 2005.

7.2.1 Increase in female full-time work force representation

Between 1986 and 2005 the female proportion of the full-time work force grows from 41% to 45%. Based on continuing the increase from 1986 to 2005 it may approach equality (50%) by 2031, while based on the slower increase from 1995 to 2005 it may reach 48%. Exhibit 7-15 shows the approach of female work force participation to 50% over time (the Gatineau long-term trend indicates that 50% will be reached by 2021, so it is capped at that level as extending it beyond 50% would require additional assumptions about work patterns that cannot be inferred from the available surveys).



Exhibit 7-15: Female representation in full-time workforce

7.2.2 Adjustment in mode shares by age group

Between 1986 and 2005, there have been notable fluctuations in the transit and auto drive mode shares, as shown in Exhibit 7-16 to Exhibit 7-21, but the overall trend indicates that male (solid-line) and female (dashed-line) mode share patterns are moving closer together.

In 1986, almost as many women age 65 and over take transit (27% mode share) as drive (29% mode share), but in 2005 many more drive (54%) than take transit (8%). The male trend is less dramatic as men over age 65 were more likely to drive than take transit in all



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

three survey years, and the mode share distribution in that category has remained almost unchanged since 1995, after a large drop in transit between 1986 and 1995.

Some of the extrapolated trend lines cross and then diverge in the future (such as in Exhibit 7-18), which is unlikely to be the case in reality, but the exhibit only reflects what would happen if existing trends were maintained. If the decline in transit mode share by women in the 55-64 (Exhibit 7-17) and over 65 (Exhibit 7-18) age groups continues, then transit mode share will reach zero by 2031. This is an extreme case, and one not likely to occur in reality, but the trends do indicate, as seen in Exhibit 7-20 and Exhibit 7-21, that driving is becoming much more frequent among women over age 55, whereas in the past there was a great disparity between male and female auto drive mode shares.

Because of the difference in trend directions between 1986, 1995 and 2005, there is a substantial difference in forecasted future mode shares depending on whether the 1986-2005 or the 1995-2005 trend is followed. This applies particularly to the 55 and over age group, as changes in the main working-age group (25-54) are much less pronounced, and male and female auto and transit mode shares are close together.



Exhibit 7-16: Transit mode shares (ages 25-54)



Exhibit 7-17: Transit mode shares (ages 55-64)



Exhibit 7-18: Transit mode shares (ages 65+)



Exhibit 7-19: Auto drive mode shares (ages 25-54)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-20: Auto drive mode shares (ages 55-64)



Exhibit 7-21: Auto drive mode shares (ages 65+)

7.2.3 Trip rate variability by gender

Historically, the daily trip rate for males has been higher than for females, but this difference has been lessening over time, to the extent that the rates are on a trend to converge in the near future, even as both male and female rates decline overall, as seen in Exhibit 7-22. Trip rate trends are investigated further in the next section.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-22: Daily trips/capita (ages 11 and up)

7.3 Trip rates

While the overall numbers of trips are increasing, the increases are not matching the growth in population. This suggests that a decrease in trip rates for future year modelling may lead to a more accurate portrayal of travel patterns. The observed trends indicate a sharp decline in trips between 1986 and 1995, followed by a levelling off between 1995 and 2005. This is the case for both work and non-work trips (although non-work trips have a shallower decline) except in the Québec districts, where there is an increase in the non-work trip rate between 1986 and 1995, but still a decline between 1995 and 2005.

Over time, as was seen in Exhibit 2-5, there is a small decrease in the proportion of people in the primary working-age (20-54) age group and a small increase in the proportion of people in the 55+ age categories, reflecting a general aging of the population. This is particularly noticeable in Gatineau where, if the age split trend from 1995 to 2005 continues into the future, by 2031 people over age 65 will represent 17% of the population, and people under 25 will represent 18%.

7.3.1 Decline in work trip rates

From 1986 to 1995 the number of daily trips to work per NCR resident decreases from 0.67 to 0.48, and from 1995 to 2005 there is a further decline to 0.47. A continuation of this to 2031 would result in a rate of 0.26 work trips/capita if the 1986-2005 trend is followed, and 0.43 work trips/capita if the 1995-2005 trend is followed. Work trips per employed worker decline comparably from 1.23 (1986) to 1.00 (2005). Thus, the decline is not due to a reduction in the labour force proportion. As the trip rates for 1986 seem particularly high (based both on comparing with other years and with the 1986-2006 TTS trip rates for Toronto), it may be preferable just to use the 1995-2005 NCR trend for



Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

extrapolation. Working at home rates do not change appreciably between 1996 and 2006 (based on census data), increasing from 6.4% to 6.5% of the workforce.²⁵

The 1986-2005 work trips trend (seen in Exhibit 7-23) is influenced by a decline from a very high initial rate in 1986 which suggests that each worker makes an average of more than one work trip per day. Due to this, the 1995-2005 trend, showing a gradual decline, may be more probable for forecasting, as using this, the work trip per capita rates remain above the 0.40 mark up to 2031. These rates are also similar to the 0.41 used in the TRANS model for 2031.



Exhibit 7-23: Daily work trips/capita (ages 11 and up)

7.3.2 Decline in non-work trip rates

From 1986 to 1995 the number of daily trips to a location other than work per NCR resident (including trips *from* work) decreases from 2.20 to 2.12, and from 1995 to 2005 there is a further decline to 1.97. This is a much more consistent decline than for work trips, with the decline from 1986 to 1995 less than that for work trips despite the inclusion of the return trips from work in this category. This means that were the return component of work trips to be excluded (if it could be identified separately from other homebound trips), non-work-related travel would likely remain the same or even show a slight increase over time.

A continuation of the trends to 2031 would result in a rate of 1.52 non-work trips/capita if the 1986-2005 trend is followed, and 1.58 non-work trips/capita if the 1995-2005 trend is followed. The rate used by the TRANS model is 1.58, matching that from the extrapolation of the 1995-2005 trend. The percentage of people over age 65 who work full or part-time increases from 6% to 9% from 1986 to 1995, but then decreases to 5% by 2005, so it is difficult to identify a trend in this case.



²⁵ Note that the 2005OD survey showed an approximate 10% work-at-home rate, compared with the 6% rate in the 1995 survey. Further investigation revealed that the 2005 question included workers who were telecommuting, in addition to people who normally work at home.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

The non-work trip rate (shown in Exhibit 7-24) either decreases slowly over time or remains near-constant, depending in which trend is used (the short-term trend indicates the decrease and the long-term trend the remaining constant, the opposite of the situation with work trips). However, the spread of options is smaller than for work trips.



Exhibit 7-24: Daily non-work trips/capita (ages 11 and up)

7.3.3 Variation in trip rates by age and region

Separating daily trip rates into three age groups (student/recent workforce entry, main workforce and retirees) as is done in Exhibit 7-25 to Exhibit 7-28, shows that trip rates as a whole are forecast to decline in the pre-retirement period, so the overall decline does not result from an increase in the proportion of retirees as the population ages. However, the recent trend shows a tendency, especially in Gatineau, for people over the age of 65 to make more trips. Thus, if the number of retirees does increase over time, this may increase the overall trip rate. The result of combining the two trends of i) change in trip rate by age and ii) change in the distribution of the population by age group, is seen below in Exhibit 7-25 and Exhibit 7-26, which display potential distribution of trips amongst age groups in 2031 compared with the 2005 split. In Ottawa, both the oldest and youngest age groups increase their share of the overall number of trips by following either the 1986-2005 or the 1995-2005 trends. However, in Gatineau, if the trend since 1995 is followed, there is a huge increase in the proportion of trips made by retirementage people, and the trip distribution diverges appreciably from that of Ottawa. If the 1986-2005 trend is followed, Ottawa and Gatineau remain similar in trip distribution by age into the future.

TRANS Committee



Exhibit 7-25: Distribution of trips by age grouping (Ontario districts)



Exhibit 7-26: Distribution of trips by age grouping (Québec districts)



Exhibit 7-27: Daily trip rates by age group (Ontario districts)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-28: Daily trip rates by age group (Québec districts)

7.4 Transit and non-motorized mode share

There is some indication of increasing transit mode shares in some areas (particularly in Gatineau) and of increasing non-motorized travel in some areas (particularly urban districts and short-distance travel to the CBD). Adjustments may need to be made to the mode share parameters in the model in order to account for these changes.

7.4.1 Increase in non-motorized share to CBD

The walk and cycle proportion of trips to Ottawa Centre in the AM peak period has increased from 8% to 14% between 1986 and 2005, while the auto drive and transit shares have remained similar (with driving decreasing, then increasing, and transit increasing, then decreasing). If the 1995-2005 trend continues, the non-motorized mode share to the district of Ottawa Centre will increase to 18% by 2031, while the corresponding transit mode share will increase from 43% to 54%. The non-motorized increase is specifically for trips to downtown, as overall in the NCR the non-motorized share in the AM peak period remains almost constant.

As seen below in Exhibit 7-29, the non-motorized share for AM peak trips to the CBD shows an increasing trend since 1995, with Ottawa maintaining a greater share than Gatineau but with both growing at a similar rate.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report



Exhibit 7-29: AM peak non-motorized mode share to CBD

7.4.2 Adjustment in work trip mode share distribution

Over both the long-term (1986-2005) and the short-term (1995-2005) periods, transit mode share has either increased or stayed the same for Ottawa and Gatineau and for all area types, despite a decline between 1986 and 1995. For each of the six district groupings (rural Ontario, rural Québec, suburban Gatineau, suburban Ottawa, central/urban Gatineau and central/urban Ottawa), the proportion of transit trips made by residents to work in the AM peak period increases between 1986 and 2005. Therefore, the overall decline in transit mode share during this period comes from purpose and/or geographical adjustments (as rural mode shares remain consistently lower than suburban mode shares, and central/urban are higher than either) rather than shifts away from transit by residents of particular areas. The ways in which these trends translate into forecasts when they are extrapolated are shown in Exhibit 7-30 to Exhibit 7-32.

Between 1995 and 2005, the proportion of suburban Gatineau residents who took transit to work increases from 9% to 19%; and for central/urban Gatineau residents the increase is from 11% to 21%. By comparison, suburban Ottawa increases from 16% to 21%, and central/urban Ottawa from 18% to 24%. If the 1986-2005 trend (shown in blue) is extrapolated, there is a gradual increase in Gatineau transit mode share over time, reaching 25-30% by 2031, while the Ottawa transit share remains almost constant at around 25%. However, it should be noted that the rapid observed increase in Gatineau's transit share since 1995 reflects the significant improvements in the transit level of service, which in turn has led to equalization in transit use characteristics between Gatineau and Ottawa. If the 1995-2005 (red) trend is extrapolated, the increase is greater for both Ottawa and Gatineau, with Gatineau still growing faster—if the 1995-2005 growth in mode share could continue to 2031, transit mode share in Gatineau would exceed 45% in central and urban districts, although in practice this is unlikely to be attainable without higher-order transit. Due to low numbers of transit users in rural areas, the rural districts are aggregated across both provinces.



Exhibit 7-30: Work trip transit mode share (rural residents)



Exhibit 7-31: Work trip transit mode share (central/urban residents)



Exhibit 7-32: Work trip transit mode share (suburban residents)

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

7.5 Analysis

Upon considering the trends described in this chapter, the most significant issue that comes to light is a demographic and economic shift towards suburbs in both Ottawa and Gatineau that is causing a change in travel patterns as radial travel (to/from central cores) is gradually replaced by localized and circumferential travel. Although the number of jobs in the central districts is still increasing, the increase is proportionally low compared with the rate of employment growth in urban and suburban areas. The long-term estimates resulting from extrapolating these shifts are comparable with the projections produced by the TRANS model.

This change has consequences for transit mode share, as trips that do not involve travel to the downtowns use transit less. Accordingly, despite the increase over time in transit mode share in individual districts, with commuting by transit gaining an increased share in rural and suburban as well as urban areas, the overall regional transit share has declined. Extensive transit improvements have helped to stop this decline in recent years, especially in Gatineau – one important trend is that transit behaviour and many other characteristics are starting to resemble each other on both sides of the Ottawa River. However, even as the proportion of people living in the central districts decreases, the number of cars per worker is increasing throughout the region (although this trend appears to be very unstable). As both people and jobs move to the suburban areas they will form new travel patterns and create new areas of capacity constraint that model projections will need to account for.

Other trends include a reduction in the differences between male and female travel patterns, and an overall decrease in the number of trips per capita for both work and non-work purposes. The trip rates change by different degrees for different age groups; people of retirement age have historically been making fewer trips on average than those of other ages, but there are indications that this difference is narrowing. This means that, especially in Gatineau (where the older age group is growing faster with respect to the whole population), the number of trips made by people over 65 may come to rival the number made by those people under 25. As these two demographics will have very different trip purposes and travel patterns, these changes present another challenge for the model to address.

While it is possible that some of these trends may be linked, analysis of the TRANS survey results does not enable us to identify causal relationships between trends over time as each survey effectively represents a snapshot of a single moment. For investigating these relationships it is interesting to look at panel surveys, which monitor the same respondents over time and are thus able to link the development of their demographic and trip-making characteristics, providing for dynamic travel behaviour analysis. In North America, the most comprehensive study has been the Puget Sound Transportation Panel (PSTP)²⁶ in the Seattle area, which surveyed 20,000 personal travel diaries in 10 "waves"

²⁶ Goulias, K., L. Blain et al, <u>Catching the Next Big Wave</u>, TRB 07-1699, 2007, pp 9-18

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

from 1989 to 2002, although eventually it was discontinued due to costs of maintenance and difficulties in replacing people who drop out over time.

The PSTP indicates that:

- Most changes in mode (i.e., from transit use to driving) occur immediately after a change in occupation or place of employment²⁷ (which may remove transit as a viable mode). When making relocation decisions, people are also likely to take their estimate of the importance of transit into account as a considering factor.
- People in households that increase car ownership increase the average number of trips made. This leads to the question of whether an increase in ownership causes the increase in trips, or the increase in trips causes the demand for more car purchases. A German mobility panel survey²⁸, still ongoing, has shown indications that those who make higher numbers of trips are the most likely category to increase their vehicle ownership. Nonetheless, the trends observed in the NCR are for an overall increase in vehicle ownership rates while at the same time a decline in the number of trips. The shift in job locations towards suburban areas that are less well served by transit may be showing an influence here. Also, the trend of ownership increase in the NCR is unstable, with the trend possibly showing a decrease depending on which survey period is extrapolated.
- It is difficult to determine whether variations in land use characteristics, gender, employment and occupation type are significant in changing trip rate. Findings do not identify any definite correlation between these.
- Trip rates are gradually decreasing over time. However, the number of trips increases with an increase in the age of children (ages 6-17) in the household, but decreases with an increase in the number of adults (18 and over). This is important to view in light of the situation in the NCR with both an increase in the average age of the population and a declining trip rate. However, there are a variety of other potential causes for declining trip rates, such as economic fluctuations and increase in fuel prices, and, as was noted before, trip rates among over-65s in the NCR are actually increasing, so it is difficult to establish a clear link with age profile and trip rates. Nonetheless, the declining trip rate appears to be a consistent phenomenon, as it is also observed in the Greater Toronto Area from the TTS.

7.6 Conclusions

This chapter has extrapolated and suggested ways to interpret the four leading influences that appear to drive changes in travel patterns: these being a shift to suburban living and working, the increase in gender balance (both in terms of working and mode share), the decline in trip rates for all trip types and the changes in mode shares. The final chapter ties together the components of the study, and describes how model development and calibration could be influenced by the study findings.



²⁷ Perk, V, J. Flynn and J. Volinski, <u>Transit Ridership, Reliability, and Retention</u>. NCTR-776-07, 2008, p. x

²⁸ Zumkeller, D., <u>Mobility Panel Surveys: the German Experience.</u> Universitat Karlsruhe, 2007.

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

8. Conclusions

Part 2 of this study (Chapters 2 to 6) has identified significant patterns that have developed in the National Capital Region between 1986 and 2005. Many of these appear to be driven by one or more key region-wide trends, such as the increasing influence of the suburbs for both population and employment growth, which may help to produce a variety of findings in categories as diverse as a reduction in transit mode share, a lowering of housing density and a decline in the proportion of trips destined to downtown. A decline in rates both for work and non-work trips is another significant trend, and it is interesting to see how the trip rates vary by age category over time. The decline in rates is not unique to the NCR—data for Toronto also show the number of work trips per capita and per worker declining between 1986 and 2006.

Part 3 of the study (Chapter 7) classifies these key trends and extrapolates them to medium-term (2021) and long-term (2031) horizons, based on the patterns observed from surveys. This indicates how trend continuations may affect travel behaviour and modelling parameters in the future.

In some cases, the trend from 1986 to 2005 indicates a different outcome, if it is continued, than the trend from 1995 to 2005 for the same indicator. For example, overall transit mode shares decrease slightly between 1986 and 2005, but increase substantially between 1995 and 2005 (with an overall pattern resembling a 'V'). In these cases, the potential divergence of alternative trends has been shown.

Overall, there is a demographic and economic shift towards suburbs in both Ottawa and Gatineau. Traditional travel patterns to and from the central districts are losing ground to trips that involve only suburban and rural areas, whether within suburban areas, circumferentially, or between newly developed localized suburban hubs.

Differences are also reduced between male and female travel patterns, with female auto use growing faster in the older age categories. The decrease in the number of trips per capita suggests a lower overall activity rate, with potential implications for future trip generation models.

Historically, people over 65 travel less than those in younger age groups, but this gap is narrowing, and trips made by over 65s may equal those made by under 25s (especially in Gatineau where the proportion of the population over 65 is growing faster). As these two demographics will have very different trip purposes and travel patterns, these changes present another challenge for the model to address.

Calibration of the steps of a model is necessarily driven by today's patterns (especially transit share, which focuses on the central core), while future patterns may be different. With the growing significance of suburb-to-suburb and other non core-focused travel, and multiple activity centres away from the CBD, screenlines and travel times may need to be

Parts 2 and 3 Final Report

calibrated in both directions to be able to deal with the increasing influence of counterpeak flows. Data may be sparse in currently dormant directions, suggesting the need for larger survey samples in suburban areas, or workplace surveys to gain a better sense of home-work patterns.

Another data collection approach that has been tried in other locations is the panel survey, where a consistent group of respondents is surveyed over a period of time. Panel surveys, while encountering significant problems in respondent attrition, have indicated a decline in trip rates over time, a link between change in jobs and change in modes, and some variability in trip rates with household age profiles.

In summary, the directions indicated by these key trends analysed in this report, if they are extrapolated to continue in the future, can, while not of themselves providing detailed projections, be compared against those projections made by the TRANS model. The additional information (beyond what was available at the time of model calibration) that is provided by the analysis of the 2005 survey and its relationship to previous surveys can assist in identifying where model parameters could be adjusted or where there may be trends that are not accounted for by the existing variables, such as changes in trip rates by age category. It also can help to identify where additional calibration or data collection methods would be useful. Overall, the survey trend analysis serves as an independent confirmation of the projections made by the TRANS model, while highlighting some areas for future investigation.

Appendix A Origin-Destination Flows by District

Table A-1: Origin-Destination Flows

TRIPS	DEST	Alta Vista	Aylmer	Bayshore / Cedarview	Beacon Hill	Gatineau Centre	Gatineau Est	Hull Périphérie	Hunt Club	Île de Hull Kar	nata / Stittsville M	Aasson-Angers	Merivale	Orléans	Ottawa Centre	Ottawa East	Ottawa Inner Area	Ottawa West	t Plateau	Rural East	Rural Northeast	Rural Northwest R	ural Southeast Rura	al Southwest Rural West	South Gloucester / South Leitrim	Nepean	TOTALS
ORIGIN	AM 1	1986 1995 2005 : 13185 13647 13602	1986 1995 200 29 28 4	19 624 1045 975	5 1986 1995 2005 5 1457 1712 185	5 1986 1995 2005 58 90 103 19	<u>5 1986 1995 200</u>	05 1986 1995 2005 00 303 260 427	5 1986 1995 2005 7 1218 1943 1707	1986 1995 2005 19 1336 817 564 1	986 1995 2005 198 107 366 883	0 45 15	1986 1995 2005	1986 1995 2005 872 533 1118	1986 1995 2005 7429 4622 4915	1986 1995 2005 2773 1861 1933	1986 1995 2005 6311 5339 5451	1986 1995 2 1758 1445 1	2005 1986 1995 20	27 0 13 56	1986 1995 2005	1986 1995 2005 19	986 1995 2005 1986 113 88 186 246	5 1995 2005 1986 1995 20 5 230 228 0 24	73 34 37 91 39	139 331	1986 1995 200 40946 36605 3811
Alta Vista	MD 3	34342 31720 28534	245 129 38	37 1756 2486 2152	2 1771 1999 238	31 621 368 489	19 354 268 34	2 275 398 620	4472 6225 7707	216 112 298 4	189 302 1683	17 25 140	4379 3747 4840	1687 2582 3761	5430 3413 2977	7397 4486 5273	9806 7128 8607	1535 1561 2	2082 0 20 2	217 206 233 271	46 66 175	39 68 242	270 486 951 274	312 541 175 131	254 436 225 402 241	419 1061	76481 68909 76387
	PM 1	18299 15863 17871	440 800 63	32 2273 1953 2429	3 2292 1830 222	<u>4 778 778 96</u>	3 326 638 69	0 769 588 745	5 4092 5563 6106	286 346 285 3	317 1025 2322 8	83 97 289	3580 3315 3624	2996 4669 6019	1399 1563 1353	4425 3474 3131	5988 5054 4992	1701 1678 1	1470 51 176 4	162 269 423 649	67 186 232	233 238 295 6	512 819 1246 385	578 665 210 475	809 470 140 628 263	887 1771	52604 53155 61404
Aylmer	MD	167 109 256	4570 6022 590 7067 12820 1048	121 358 374 39 167 232 210		1 167 322 715 71 67 354 72	20 285 44 45	8 880 1497 1759	48 21 88	514 540 268	43 129 301 39 42 188	0 19 123	667 251 526	0 68 54	634 547 668	182 339 310 299 174 64	365 498 741	293 238	309 216 99 4	194 0 0 18 187 0 0 0	0 19 84	23 130 186 90 423 806	20 0 18 49 59 6 0 31	12 26 0 21		44 27 0 16	14672 18233 20261 11920 18127 18524
	PM	231 260 189	4357 8614 703	36 69 132 124	4 0 41 4	41 196 254 444	4 292 84 43	6 435 882 786	5 43 <u>112</u> 97	298 47 184 1	107 <u>5</u> 133 :	15 42 199	67 26 216	0 41 108	41 129 85	41 83 156	118 176 280	43 86	218 91 240 4	148 0 <mark>0</mark> 0	0 39 296	230 545 780	0 0 0 16	0 28 0 41	34 0 0 45 0	39 17	6689 11915 12379
Bayshore /	AM	2471 2071 2729	100 25 3	33 11067 11359 11352	2 181 212 53	2 82 21 137	2 0 45 5	19 194 322 378 110 300 301	8 289 537 588	1252 938 681 12	213 1531 2591	0 21 16	5914 6602 5012	75 23 229	6227 4032 3441	556 541 828	4160 3709 2865	6266 4498 4	4021 0 0	0 0 6 21	0 0 26	0 21 29	0 26 58 301		48 30 90 126 132 111 1373 2	460 820	40617 37696 37131
Cedarview	PM	690 1397 1264	346 340 40	09 15977 17626 12417	7 65 233 28	34 52 146 16 ⁴	ig 0 240 10	9 237 384 373	3 265 725 993	131 115 71 35	594 3976 4922	17 0 15	4154 6078 4527	103 925 1155	5 539 608 605	300 507 750	1729 1915 1855	3218 4284 3	3260 0 59 1	120 16 57 116	0 66 93	133 129 56 3	165 210 403 1133	3 1054 1042 784 1735 8	359 33 25 195 1301 2	2887 2956	34981 45722 39016
	AM	1844 1702 1953	0 0 1	14 97 418 252	2 4331 5030 437	/1 0 0 4?	1 0 21 1	13 283 203 333	3 126 227 170	1128 419 326	66 71 228	0 19 0	0 792 678 776	869 656 1058	3705 2405 2459	1926 1657 1467	2618 1753 2070	423 272	534 0 0	0 0 0 19	0 0 15	0 0 12	0 67 17 0	0 51 0 24	0 0 0 8 0	23 30	18208 15646 16214
Beacon Hill	MD	2062 2679 2646	23 84 9	0 126 338 482	2 7484 8771 9939	.9 280 206 166	6 44 42 15 19 44 159 26	53 27 106 270 52 75 241 406	241 423 355	116 114 111	53 119 243 16 258 345	0 47 78	341 285 548	2667 3538 2990	1719 704 1034 615 461 372	3532 3589 4313 2021 2078 2529	1426 1348 1945 1093 832 1010	165 258	454 0 45	82 32 147 154	0 27 111	0 26 0	0 157 224 0	0 34 19 22	0 231 30 77 0	49 70	20588 23153 26570
	AM	741 664 847	137 103 32	27 58 222 283	3 436 419 45	57 4401 9838 773!	is 1130 1449 207	0 2807 3560 4179	227 223 68	1928 2585 2179	0 163 280	17 149 193	298 286 527	99 41 290	2432 2826 3179	612 687 554	1813 1532 1131	712 833	558 88 82 1	164 0 0 30	118 73 349	45 150 76	0 42 0 0	0 0 111 0 0	20 47 21 66 0	0 0	18146 25950 25672
Gatineau Centre	MD	338 334 389	136 364 67	70 31 92 135	δ 85 132 10 ⁴	18 8353 20640 1625F	6 2960 4958 570	07 2395 2698 4074	16 0 136	705 927 679	0 0 35 33	315 327 992	2 0 193 195	41 43 165	749 603 326	541 294 375	711 675 528	78 126	216 0 138 5	96 0 0 18	257 1200 1853	39 221 322	0 0 0 0	0 42 0 23	0 0 0 13 0	0 18	17750 33988 33848
	AM	90 <u>38</u> 213 448 613 671	188 325 93 281 134 36	32 45 0 22 54 43 156 73	2 0 65 17 3 0 112 41	7 6530 14066 12075 10 1828 4286 471	5 2342 5755 573	1266 1656 2258 1 2230 2297 3198	0 67 62 0 183 72	328 401 329	43 67 190 12	228 636 886 125 343 420	0 22 48		272 300 263	277 109 178 168 635 365	317 252 241 1053 1093 1066	78 0 185 373	443 0 24 2		0 276 249	0 18 173	0 24 0 0	0 28 39 0 0		25 62	12705 25361 27594 15935 22809 24011
Gatineau Est	MD	101 266 222	348 172 28	35 50 123 156	6 87 42 7	/0 3769 5140 611?	.3 9569 11280 919	0 1411 1536 2122	2 84 22 62	234 401 396	0 0 21 34	344 403 480	119 0 114	58 42 144	609 225 304	173 174 155	206 340 423	200 65	72 0 56 3	37 0 19 0	516 1129 1599	21 126 176	0 0 39 0	0 15 0 24	0 0 0 0 0	0 33	17900 21586 22527
	PM	87 87 191	176 191 30	07 0 23 30	<u>) 0 44 6</u>	6 1885 3331 3167	3 3985 8009 630	07 611 951 902	2 48 41 27	233 485 230	0 22 87 2	213 484 812	98 0 0	87 23 43	203 45 193	382 67 142	129 86 90	110 23	60 0 37 3		474 711 1531	21 53 148	0 12 33 0	0 70 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 16	8743 14724 14830
Hull Périphérie	MD	700 488 502	914 1836 180	09 342 495 262	2 23 172 34	42 2632 3066 402'	5 437 420 05 25 885 1465 225	5 20008 21828 21409	111 210 151	4353 3061 2341	0 22 177 3	49 84 121 315 248 872	263 153 349	121 219 344	2169 992 1070	616 161 483	1364 1195 1075	555 398	253 274 717 23	32 0 6 55	131 470 1212	537 678 825	0 17 37 0	0 11 52 0 0	15 0 23 0 0	0 153	36314 37933 42399
	PM	274 193 555 2	2098 2369 304	15 203 321 338	3 276 202 29	0 2818 4255 463	.3 1418 2475 262	26 12251 13586 12420	220 63 335	2278 1672 1521 2	259 <u>65</u> 350 43	139 <u>514</u> 1135	85 258 227	418 323 698	616 431 608	429 397 546	524 557 605	293 166	313 469 1287 24	153 63 <mark>32</mark> 73	621 607 2029	893 1157 1587	39 12 21 64	11 55 19 87	38 0 0 26 33	85 230	27101 31125 36758
Hunt Club	AM	4411 6626 7473	0 27 5	212 602 794 17 164 668 903	4 443 406 75	8 0 44 10F	5 48 38 2 43 105 17	27 234 131 292 24 187 175 183	2 2071 4407 4648	254 558 698	34 196 548 0 207 713	0 0 0	1129 2179 3184	95 327 427	2285 2835 3180 1120 1087 1152	557 964 658 556 1117 938	2780 2749 3785	758 659 493 275	900 0 0	0 0 26 66	0 0 0 27 0 15	0 0 0	54 727 724 43 310 488 770 111	97 321 38 46	22 72 190 228 138 19 269 174 531 0	108 182 274 394	15664 23959 29111 14022 22570 29965
	PM	1554 3284 2850	43 58 35	53 565 838 792	2 190 217 26	51 136 127 8	3 43 <u>227</u> 4	19 114 123 150	2818 6509 7229	47 154 46 1	135 308 491 3	16 <u>19</u> 40	492 1221 1400	<u>315 1096</u> 930	280 575 320	241 569 673	1027 812 1448	435 457	649 0 78 1	133 48 70 82	69 45 51	45 58 89	522 742 743 187	7 <u>196</u> 328 0 183	196 301 50 427 196	389 653	9816 18404 20467
Îlo do kult	AM	213 259 325	41 92 14		3 137 206 11	.7 109 216 237	2 396 159 17	1 1585 1342 836		2349 1475 1020	0 5 112	0 0 28	208 197 224	16 26 81	825 796 636	304 219 97	516 774 542	331 221	363 93 29	0 0 0 0	0 33 59	0 69 0	0 0 0 0	0 43 0 0	0 16 0 0 0	0 45	7327 6309 5163
ne de Hull	PM	193 164 308 1312 950 474	526 439 34 1629 1575 102	42 302 248 191 28 1408 915 711	. 3/1 110 158 .1 942 362 37	3 900 1028 848 23 2128 2817 222	4 1508 1834 14 ⁵	5 4237 3530 3147 57 4580 4282 3594	4 131 408 579	4040 3731 2085 2535 1948 1179	48 29 241 13 105 355 413 2	277 599 560	192 268 236 1263 483 550	964 1068 1007	2699 985 731 1822 1296 638	295 194 192 912 517 495	2347 1360 1175	1113 734	100 103 190 3 609 257 668 10	078 103 70 46	410 546 1127	92 97 86 475 530 474	99 84 52 194	119 40 19 103	87 28 0 117 228	26 50 155 367	27091 23779 2040F
Kanata /	AM	372 1041 2088	32 5 10	09 4102 4021 4337	7 32 253 32	1 0 24 97	2 0 22 5	6 185 108 341	1 74 251 545	505 509 343 58	362 10316 21748	0 0 0	1741 2274 3383	72 69 344	2618 2549 3202	273 426 731	1020 1787 2618	1181 1252 1	1319 0 0	25 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	20 26 117 224	145 1056 264 1922	799 0 5 42 16	162 690	18595 27166 44305
Stittsville	MD	277 326 1597	75 19 12	20 3501 3877 5648	3 86 48 27	4 0 38 52	2 91 5 7/	0 14 33 112	2 77 187 732	0 48 254 84	29 14008 37286	35 0 15	1092 1257 3073	154 75 572	469 637 1054	78 164 551	564 795 2306	935 497 1	1147 0 0	54 16 6 62	0 0 112	0 5 48	0 86 92 785	238 1918 645 3052 24		275 701	17648 25675 60423
	AM	557 161 225	49 19 8	34 0 0 0	0 51 58 13	4 0 121 333 38 250 452 88 ^t	9 247 451 61	10 566 610 1327	7 32 19 37	470 493 678	0 23 32 292	21 4406 3705	50 26 66	34 19 75	469 307 182	84 158 56	112 181 239	49 126	74 0 0	41 0 0 0	66 118 203	0 0 62	0 0 17 0	0 17 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0	6006 7627 8757
Masson-Angers	MD	0 24 90	82 19 17	70 0 23 17	7 0 24 6	i6 192 502 940	.0 334 250 57	78 349 313 703	3 0 23 14	128 0 144	0 0 0 338	389 7489 6903	34 0 75	32 0 104	132 88 90	34 96 100	85 83 77	17 0	0 17 0	0 0 0 0	59 450 532	26 28 38	0 6 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0	4910 9417 10642
	AM	0 0 33 3475 2990 3396	0 19 19	0 21 16 21 2721 3489 2658	3 0 24 29 8 167 339 46	<u>9 196 365 358</u>	8 174 423 68 49 33 0	0 153 282 245	4 0 0 0 5 648 913 805	17 0 56 1309 666 678 5	0 0 15 320	0 0 15	0 0 54	0 29 79	0 39 15	0 <u>39</u> 75 956 584 1054	0 79 94	0 0 6305 4332 4	14 0 0	35 0 6 15	42 688 407	47 8 24	0 0 18 0 56 68 123 324	0 0 0 0 0	0 17 0 10 0	0 22	3971 7306 6524 41509 35992 37745
Merivale	MD	3588 3344 4080	570 223 50	00 8399 11448 8299	9 222 379 67	/8 80 62 39!	15 293 66 4	8 89 218 408	8 952 1936 2501	489 224 238 9	016 984 2830	17 0 0	34514 27730 31521	453 981 1364	4520 1962 2662	1707 1210 1777	7587 6123 7121	8962 4316 7	7526 0 20	98 0 126 84	0 21 119	58 128 215 3	371 226 647 1021	577 946 298 454	163 178 137 436 1537 2	2707 3096	76820 65602 78051
	PM	3043 2615 3089	538 450 71	12 6514 7554 5367	7 683 507 75	/0 212 373 46?	3 139 208 27	7 465 352 555	5 1126 1868 2419	26 296 163 14	109 1735 3503 8	84 0 158	18272 14743 17044	814 1394 2344	1430 1211 535	1339 1157 1451	3567 3025 3993	4658 3056 3	3451 0 202 1	80 95 121 115	0 118 254	103 157 233 4	474 597 590 1413	3 1113 1616 548 722 4	154 212 70 361 1738 2	937 3491	48903 46582 53565
Orléans	MD AM	3742 5148 5348 1509 2141 3950	0 20 5	31 87 529 779	9 1772 2157 26 ⁴	8 0 65 125 42 0 26 13'	5 0 0 7 8 33 0 9	3 519 434 833 2 81 180 315	3 438 988 685 5 122 577 507	1226 1230 1160 10 153 44 93	61 65 573 C	0 50 59 15 0 87	228 895 1350	8307 15567 21781 12042 27822 37927	921 859 1446	2202 2481 3366 2049 1852 2320	3518 4405 4735 1099 2328 3145	880 1217 1 191 450	663 0 0	48 91 287 600 37 539 1246 2094	0 10 16	0 23 56 21 32 172	36 218 228 35 79 119 343 80	0 17 236 0 43 0 44 204 0 135	47 16 79 236 35 47 231 91 103 0	10 310 54 373	21313 41866 59561
	PM	891 922 1637	23 84 7	77 106 306 521	1 873 1480 159	<u>42 0 87 335</u>	,5 59 64 26	60 43 129 300	0 48 423 662	16 49 51	94 45 510 5	51 <u>62</u> 79	347 344 590	11578 20314 22449	184 283 413	738 1295 1144	464 503 1114	138 197	207 0 0	53 738 1337 1515	20 70 112	81 81 11	20 102 160 16	5 <mark>32</mark> 84 <u>3822</u> :	109 128 10 107 17	7 197	16712 28250 34291
Ottawa Centre	AM	1118 1111 809 4224 2979 2905	83 17 3	35 444 186 212 37 2057 1826 1383	2 188 251 219	.9 89 68 136	6 46 45 4 ⁴		276 291 44	879 921 327 1		0 19 0	458 842 346	0 225 133	4792 3264 2191	530 437 297 4291 2328 2705	2372 2382 1357 14359 9779 9022	728 734	505 0 39	12 32 6 0	20 6 0	21 13 0 212 168 70	39 17 0 0 59 41 388 246	0 5 34 0 20 99 414 70 182		22 64	12587 11283 7241 64106 46099 45538
ottawa centre	PM	7869 4554 4262	2083 1970 189	5 5905 3758 2871	1 3553 2026 202	21 2667 2931 285/	4 1277 1837 206	4 2358 1833 2664	1 2384 2684 3026	1136 659 810 22	290 2413 3088 44	448 364 337	7348 3732 3733	6429 6338 6815	7416 5261 4529	6189 <u>3725</u> 3859	12332 10821 10855	4860 2754 2	2903 206 312 9	977 484 312 405	541 603 1020	591 632 734 4	408 466 943 921	591 428 268 596	514 200 18 382 1446 1	100 405	81608 63081 66666
au	AM	3716 2753 2751	43 26 2	29 181 367 451	1 649 1521 236	j1 <u>186</u> 21 70	0 0 23 8	38 377 308 415	5 119 598 345	735 633 642 1	150 215 342	0 0 50	1286 1107 1439	220 605 490	6116 3871 4146	5457 5369 5811	3803 3861 3891	981 891	848 0 0	0 0 0 32	0 23 0	45 0 30	0 31 81 16	0 200 <mark>50</mark> 0	93 45 44 69 0	26 65	24174 22291 24738
Ottawa East	MD PM	6376 4273 4235 3970 2419 3176	181 159 16 190 336 23	52 516 574 796 33 489 586 660	3 2911 3385 3773 0 2991 2243 212	3 339 466 254 30 784 653 67	4 272 223 8 /2 204 347 51	2 525 178 522	2 525 813 1048 495 683 707	591 210 190 220 336 164 7	46 127 500 3 772 470 741 10	15 92 70 102 100 179	1442 1288 1625	1554 1770 2591 2480 2406 3173	4235 2585 2428	17639 19501 16538 8570 9538 8242	6313 4288 4218 2661 2285 2415	1089 451 1 784 670	1043 0 20 539 0 66 1	62 184 76 167	20 76 163	39 39 169 226 99 209	83 205 207 74 138 127 427 146	115 97 0 7 105 182 19 123	78 138 20 94 31 183 190 0 82 131	75 325	45137 41014 41438
Ottawa Inner	AM	4091 4181 3968	41 64 8	30 1208 1391 1350	0 671 765 87	/8 47 218 10	7 39 64 8	37 519 447 564	4 959 675 1033	2668 1562 1420 5	91 417 1115	17 21 82	3353 2151 3163	216 313 494	11429 8848 10092	1892 1705 1907	13889 12687 15170	2405 1846 2	2236 <u>60</u> 20	50 0 0 37	38 0 89	0 8 21	0 46 112 46	5 52 148 56 106	103 0 0 109 <u>35</u>	84 64	44269 37672 44477
Area	MD 1	10738 6684 7704	609 503 62	28 2698 4167 3413	3 1832 1448 1929	.9 898 567 531	1 336 295 33	37 1376 1004 1040	0 1740 2215 3260	1226 1000 553 6	570 737 1975	0 63 158	6744 5040 6463	1259 1955 2566	5 17212 12275 10404	6104 4308 4737	24567 32404 35912	4833 3121 3	3797 85 78 1	185 36 64 141	47 90 249	152 207 176	59 137 395 387		306 252 71 194 401 303 201 70 268 285	314 1005	84358 79054 88563
	AM	1527 1373 1857	0 62 7	78 1443 2147 2076	6 285 142 31	17 85 5 5/	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	2 2140 1003 1703 15 265 187 279	e 63 416 378	1020 845 698 F	546 331 1009	0 0 30	3282 2865 2959	27 147 220	4471 3150 3253	698 561 528	3282 2978 2901	6127 6732 8	3005 0 0	0 0 0 19	0 20 42	39 50 56	0 77 43 62	2 25 64 19 89	77 0 0 17 0	53 318	23371 22253 25309
Ottawa West	MD	2640 1587 2045	252 423 35	58 10207 10097 6853	3 376 229 46	4 167 296 197	7 115 85 33	89 449 428 340	0 538 522 756	430 256 221 8	352 653 1358 3	17 19 28	9194 5335 7825	221 394 820	4304 1723 1744	1228 831 972	4806 3689 4285	18078 12908 20	0877 <mark>0</mark> 39 1	46 0 19 33	0 38 121	130 140 216	20 12 179 339	9 138 495 206 283 2	281 44 23 52 240	265 804	54853 40432 51809
-	AM	1617 1364 1183 154 175 615	893 716 87 70 214 21	79 7267 4826 4567	<u>/ 390 242 49</u>	3 612 779 636 	5 304 416 42 70 0 39 27	25 757 542 670 306 1043 1846	396 735 912 0 78 139	611 214 285 10 514 605 1272	0 59 75	34 165 134 0 0 14	6640 3933 4434	924 1052 1253	257 469 1090	978 924 941	2555 2338 3054 154 293 563	9074 7730 11	498 0 176 9	194 63 64 133	47 97 225	86 139 105 3	185 178 162 441	1 278 378 344 382 1 20 58 0 0	216 134 20 233 656	593 1553 0 13	37745 29870 37661 1610 4174 8898
Plateau	MD	0 59 216	251 117 48	37 0 39 33	3 0 6 10	J8 51 140 577	3 0 79 33	2 575 871 2060	0 0 20 0	196 140 257	0 0 69	0 0 69	0 39 174	0 0 56	0 117 240	0 39 41	51 240 279	0 20	114 139 117 12	138 0 0 0	0 0 98	0 8 210	0 0 0 0		21 0 0 0 0	0 11	1263 2051 6684
	PM	0 0 96	41 217 57		3 0 39 1/ 1 278 206 27	.6 88 143 270	0 0 80 24	2 203 240 1031		0 109 109	0 0 0	0 0 65		0 20 23		17 0 28	60 39 104	0 20	43 0 318 16	684 0 0 0	47 31 153	21 21 207	0 0 0 0		0 0 0 0 0	0 0	477 1278 4687
Rural East	MD	404 440 628 63 159 278	0 0 3	17 16 108 151 37 0 54 58	8 32 126 16	52 0 0 (0 0 6	0 0 6 14	48 102 67	151 57 62 16 0 0	32 32 82 0 6 35	0 13 15	32 32 77	458 1218 1553	0 25 71	2/8 159 31/ 246 102 111	293 331 380 118 83 233	48 83	60 0 0	0 535 803 642	0 6 0	0 6 27	16 57 15 C	32 36 0 6	0 16 38 0 0	0 0	1592 2841 3631
	PM	105 229 200	0 0	0 0 51 (J 48 32 9'	.6 0 <mark>6</mark> 49	<u>9 0 0 1</u>	18 0 6 C	0 26 65	0 6 10	0 6 18	0 0 0	0 6 42	164 570 1101	. 0 <mark>19</mark> 17	79 <mark>25</mark> 34	32 13 113	16 <mark>20</mark>	0 0 0	0 539 820 885	0 0 0	0 0 14	20 12 0 0	0 12 0 0	0 0 0 28 0	0 0	1002 1849 2700
Rural Northeast	AM MD	74 167 218	27 60 26 0 65 7	0 0 55 44	1 20 121 150 1 20 6 8	0 737 984 2992 32 339 1046 183	2 540 1178 211 32 251 595 60	3 842 637 2148 3 294 420 829		349 630 1129 123 106 184	0 0 91 112	84 526 492	74 78 276	20 64 93	470 715 925 88 93 122	61 84 265 41 18 77	243 284 288 42 51 266	106 164 53 57	199 27 12 1 55 0 0	76 0 6 0	1091 728 1367 396 1585 1573	88 39 176 61 30 404	0 0 0 0			0 51	5927 6482 13435 1879 4744 7238
	PM	63 <mark>6</mark> 50	0 0 14	16 102 0 26	6 0 <u>0</u> 1	15 77 436 76!	5 177 464 66	6 61 140 298	8 0 <mark>0</mark> 25	95 43 53	0 0 18 6	66 246 330) <u>39 0</u> 29	0 5 0	19 18 63	105 0 34	58 49 54	80 0	49 0 0	41 0 6 16	947 995 1822	39 <mark>75</mark> 96	0 0 11 0	0 5 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 16	1928 2487 4624
Rural Northwest	AM	222 198 348	163 442 102 218 418 53	28 39 138 63	3 21 75 9	1 139 134 253	3 0 49 24	2 887 1209 1557	7 52 53 71	623 615 595	0 29 79 6	68 13 62	98 209 212	19 35 11	763 782 739	158 131 180 10 60 130	429 485 495	115 159	211 21 12 1		38 22 63	1371 1817 1858	0 5 0 0			31 27	5225 6648 8425
Rulai Northwest	PM	0 11 61	42 207 22	25 21 32 149	9 0 4 1	14 169 224 12	2 39 73 22	12 031 757 973 13 156 377 330	0 17 71 0 0 10 29	21 41 0	19 9 84 19 31 0	0 4 57	0 52 102	0 14 81	81 114 14	45 14 92	21 39 186	71 4	175 0 49 2 19 0 21 1		168 56 114	1380 2190 2028		0 7 35 0 22	0 0 0 6 0	20 17 5 11	2232 3559 3900
	AM	651 912 1463	79 6	0 138 326 453	3 99 202 23	18 <mark>008</mark> 4	A 0 6 1	17 59 35 68	3 272 549 607	59 81 91	39 116 213	0 0 0	<mark>454 632 778</mark>	59 78 291	823 594 1070	193 169 564	533 531 851	178 174	133 0 0	0 20 12 26	0 0 0	0 0 0 10	065 3086 3501 625	<u>381 266 0 23</u>	0 217 125 247 56	41 161	5620 8077 11124
Rural Southeast	MD PM	342 495 949 212 255 442			3 33 124 19 5 0 86 1	7 0 18 0 19 0 82 2	0 0 0 3	13 0 17 23 13 0 6 17	3 316 804 1168 7 192 469 574	0 0 17 3	20 39 136	0 0 0	299 329 431	. 36 228 275 0 148 273	39 47 306	39 166 292 0 113 184	99 188 411 93 85 219	79 51	75 0 0	0 20 18 0			196 3656 3875 312 881 2627 2365 278	2 700 930 0 12 3 412 558 19 12	92 123 67 217 0 33 28 5 161 0	53 343 79 235	2986 7210 10000 1850 4893 5857
	AM	357 625 676	16 34	0 745 997 769	9 65 93 23	32 0 5 35	9 0 0 E	67 64 19 109	151 214 363	258 149 111 5	526 382 1430	0 0 0	1608 1164 1444	49 33 81	1227 705 667	178 121 157	634 547 765	469 306	259 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 5 18	0 7 14	278 523 689 2631	1 3293 3479 32 269	84 82 75 88 146	233 305	9515 9800 11849
Rural Southwest	t MD	319 338 642	16 0 1	14 1194 924 1074	4 0 23 3	.2 0 0 8F	8 0 0 5	5 16 0 32	2 16 205 213	0 7 31 7	771 250 2104	0 0 0	805 689 967	36 63 162	195 63 171	83 81 177	334 425 454	458 95	571 0 0	0 0 13 0	0 0 22	45 0 0 5	550 437 507 4960	0 6186 5789 54 594 3	26 49 111 331 259	455 746	10159 10959 14310
	AM	245 201 193 229 582 415	49 U 11 0 0	0 1147 1473 923	3 0 45 F	2 0 4 92 57 0 0 0		0 38 27 16	5 57 111 109	57 109 123 17	21 2196 2897	0 0 35	428 233 641 478 979 785	35 <u>27</u> 310 0 44 55	322 717 604	76 222 158	272 443 555	516 495	366 0 0	0 0 13 38	0 0 0	19 0 0	0 27 43 38	3 467 93 1167 2192 20	30 30 249 201 371 0 22 16 57	93 49	5697 10245 10163
Rural West	MD	195 118 208	0 21	0 676 1633 586	ō 19 0 3	18 0 22 1f	.6 0 0 1	15 0 0 23	3 0 69 52	0 0 14 4	192 3217 2334	0 0 16	210 435 376	0 90 66	38 54 200	87 20 82	172 326 412	210 258	327 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 4 52	0 50 37 16	5 313 147 1337 5348 28	390 0 0 43 57	173 160	3509 12153 8093
South	PM	0 89 72	0 23 1	18 70 765 232	2 0 0 6		1 0 23 5		92 43 0 307 111 404	0 0 0 5	0 0 161	0 0 0	19 262 279	0 106 34	0 43 69	0 26 83	19 108 129	96 183	117 0 0	21 0 0 0	0 0 14	0 8 14	0 17 39 80	374 132 946 2757 20	000 38 0 15 0	129 157	1915 7142 4958
Gloucester /	MD	420 237 507	0 0 5	55 63 5 155	5 32 40 1	16 0 0 (0 0 0	0 0 0 17	7 227 262 598	0 23 38	0 10 73	0 0 0	386 73 291	56 133 165	47 0 114	28 0 109	190 50 309	0 23	57 0 0	0 28 11 0	0 0 0	0 5 11 2	143 22 177 36	5 70 286 0 0	13 244 10 479 0	10 97	1901 984 3568
Leitrim	PM	144 105 81	0 21 7	71 60 44 135	5 94 20	0 47 21 74	4 0 23 5	2 0 0 7	7 64 119 299	0 0 0	0 24 99	0 0 21	234 110 144	16 61 279	0 5 72	45 0 109	100 27 154	0 22	47 0 0	14 32 51 19	0 0 51	0 0 11 1	178 84 297 82	80 183 0 0	0 157 10 543 0	35 119	1253 859 2881
South Nepean	MD	492 966 2234 293 470 1113	0 0 1	1302 2819 2654 17 785 2065 2344	4 0 0 17	2 0 25 48	8 0 0 3	33 91 357 0 36 0 153	277 550 643 101 298 458	228 247 348 1/ 67 26 33 7	392 1733 316 165 865	0 0 22	2498 4193 4105 1221 1507 3079	0 22 175	1599 1662 3007 126 383 466	157 116 576 31 91 214	256 552 1189	665 632 1 446 249	836 0 0	24 0 0 19	0 0 27	0 0 28	0 55 183 146 36 79 245 238	302 238 31 111 3 3 444 863 0 197	66 44 5 102 1758 3	1230 8364 13534	9713 14782 28894 5754 10131 26157
	PM	294 90 483	0 44 2	25 814 1046 1328	<u>8 0 23 8</u>	s7 0 17 4(0 0 0 5	2 0 4 154	4 41 149 367	0 0 1	128 199 689	0 0 0	502 436 1899	35 78 202	75 44 118	0 33 44	100 159 539	240 63	464 0 0	0 0 13 54	0 0 43	0 35 11	20 94 183 283	3 326 451 95 186 :	128 20 20 84 1371 <mark>3</mark>	9066	4016 6187 16510
TOTALS	AM 4	46247 49998 56683	6571 8109 953 2103 18581 1937	34 26211 33108 32156	5 14074 17248 2086 7 18924 21094 2550	5 9490 18145 20757	7 8995 12031 1406	2 23343 25952 33043	8019 13674 14200	26755 23829 22089 115	44 18406 38616 433	312 5680 5364 760 9412 10974	41246 43380 48284	12210 20616 30252	80255 62917 68432	20947 20156 22911	58016 56923 62003 80518 79447 01051	32933 29324 31	1277 309 656 26	79 730 1180 1635	1457 1400 2831 1762 5563 0075	1746 2554 3201 13	716 5230 6327 4785	5387 7939 1888 5510 4 10390 14561 3658 12390 7	707 863 867 2044 2251 3	119 12876 4	46914 485400 574765
	PM 4	49389 41786 47810 14	4358 19659 2079	6 48389 48215 40214	4 19283 16556 1768	30 21572 33683 3240	0 13521 24415 2463	8 27596 28693 30552	2 15414 23932 29658	8937 7864 6412 193	341 26483 48474 54	410 9081 9888	50348 42142 48448	33182 47876 57935	23741 19647 16668	31689 28665 28879	52568 50380 56361	31921 24878 31	1004 1279 4117 100	022 3420 4283 5151	4313 6696 13687	4984 6860 8151 48	B16 7355 9326 9301	9995 11545 4947 11034 84	128 2424 544 4277 8186 15	037 28368 5	10328 559876 646773

Appendix B Tables of Trip-based Indicators

Table B-1: Tr	ips by purpose	e and occupation	(daily where no	ot specified)
	-po of purpose	and occupation	(adding which child	, o specifica

Trip-based values								If no valu	es for scho	ol bus, it	is classifie	ed with pu	blic transi	t
	In 1986,	school bu	ses are co	unted wit	h public tr	ansit		If no valu	es for moto	orcycle, i	t is classifi	ed with "o	ther"	
Indicator	Year	Auto-driver	Auto-passenger	oublic transit	School bus	Taxi	3icycle	Nalk	Motorcycle	Other		All modes	Transit	Occupancy
Trips to work/work related	1986	307242	52131	100263	07	4459	5817	28774	2	3196		501882	100263	
Trips to work/work related	1995	301117	45659	65530		2369	5753	37510		1976		459913	65530	
Trips to work/work related	2005	348729	41442	97571		4184	9133	39130	540	1643		542372	97571	
Trips to school	1986	24248	13367	63385		291	4027	20271		1047		126636	63385	
Trips to school	1995	25379	21365	71381		304	4882	36779		566		160656	71381	
Trips to school	2005	21673	30687	98658		246	3388	33726	64	986		189428	98658	
Trips to serve a passenger	1986	118840	18694	29		0	0	43		26		137631	29	
Trips to serve a passenger	1995	177507	19591	2605		92	324	7001		113		207232	2605	
Trips to serve a passenger	2005	159142	11611	2064		68	524	7503	0	62		180974	2064	
Trips to return home	1986	406987	126634	159094		4250	11671	51691		2746		763073	159094	
Trips to return home	1995	543078	161578	141617		4566	14845	113358		2792		981833	141617	
Trips to return home	2005	651342	158413	203550		5512	16832	125983	1027	4063		1166721	203550	
Trips for other purposes	1986	360166	129422	74014		3573	5985	45623		1729		620512	74014	
Trips for other purposes	1995	388994	148559	39723		2709	7176	85619	407	2471		675251	39723	
Trips for other purposes	2005	442799	132590	46996		2837	/363	92237	487	2779		/2808/	46996	
Trips for all purposes	1986	121/484	340247	396784		12573	27500	146401		8/43		2149733	396784	
Trips for all purposes	1995	1430074	390752	320850		10040	32981	280207	2110	/91/		2484885	320850	
Trips for all purposes	2005	1023085 912020	374743	440039		7025	37239	296579	2119	9000		1246201	194252	
Trips by full-time workers	1980	021529	155211	119202	255	7925 5476	12400	07041		1008		1240201	119202	
Trips by full-time workers	2005	10/1656	132515	170960	1126	2470 8824	12400	118330		4000		1320473	110205	
Trips by part-time workers	1986	120678	37908	1/0900	1120	1197	3510	17/75		1101		228272	1/0300	
Trips by part-time workers	1995	184619	54106	40729	4170	1123	4982	38736		1078		329544	40729	
Trips by part-time workers	2005	93031	15139	16319	347	294	2058	15036		394		142618	16319	
Trips by students	1986	65682	69095	137785		1498	12774	49333		2488		338654	137785	
Trips by students	1995	160457	125507	108463	60199	2210	15861	116185		2101		590982	108463	
Trips by students	2005	87876	134931	143898	80875	2003	11125	100752		3822		565282	143898	
Trips by non worker-students	1986	248652	94881	59025		2522	2965	24537		436		433018	59025	
Trips by non worker-students	1995	262622	94350	29307	110	2267	3594	55356		1448		449055	29307	
Trips by non worker-students	2005	401137	91157	35243	72	1725	5258	64452		2913		601956	35243	
Number of work trips	1995	300645	45560	64853	606	2369	5753	37397	537	1439		459160	64853	
Number of work trips	2005	348729	41442	95718	1853	4184	9133	39130	540	1643		542372	95718	
Sum of work trip lengths (km)	1995	3403812	459454	573511	5071	10655	26407	44486	4340	78932		4606668	573511	
Sum of work trip lengths (km)	2005	3618107	379451	909715	13873	19808	50410	49270	5195	14981		5060810	909715	
Average work trip length (km)	1995	11.3	10.1	8.8	8.4	4.5	4.6	1.2	8.1	54.9		10.0	8.8	
Average work trip length (km)	2005	10.4	9.2	9.5	7.5	4.7	5.5	1.3	9.6	9.1		9.3	8.9	
AM peak work/work related trips	1986											288652		
AM peak work/work related trips	1995											2/230/		
AM peak school trips	1986											85561		
AM peak school trips	1995											113967		
AM peak school trips	2005											139254		
AM peak serve passenger trips	1986											40768		
AM peak serve passenger trips	1995											50471		
AM peak serve passenger trips	2005											53922		
AM peak return home trips	1986											8439		
AM peak return home trips	1995											16492		
AM peak return home trips	2005											21341		
AM peak other trips	1986											29083		
AM peak other trips	1995											43446		
AM peak other trips	2005											46452		
PM peak work/work related trips	1986											27485		
PM peak work/work related trips	1995											24251		
PM peak work/work related trips	2005											21901		
PM neak school trins	1900											/719		
PM peak school trips	2005											5567		
PM peak serve passenger trips	1986											37178		
PM peak serve passenger trips	1995											46732		
PM peak serve passenger trips	2005											49996		
PM peak return home trips	1986											319558		
PM peak return home trips	1995											359321		
PM peak return home trips	2005											438088		
PM peak other trips	1986											126425		
PM peak other trips	1995											141055		
PM peak other trips	2005											139668		
Table B-2	2: Trips	by time	period.	gender.	length and	d licence sta	tus (dail [,]	v where not s	pecified)					
-----------	----------	---------	---------	---------	------------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------					
		~	p	B,				,	p • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					

Trip-based values	la 1000	a a b a a l b i						If no valu	es for scho	ol bus, it	is classified with p	ublic trans	it
	In 1986	, school bu	ises are co	ounted wi	th public t	ransit		If no valu	es for mot	orcycle, i	t is classified with "	other	
		to-driver	to-passenger	blic transit	hool bus	xi	sycle	¥	otorcycle	her	modes	ansit	cupancy
Indicator	Year	Au	Au	Pu	Sc	Ta	Bio	Ma	M	đ	AII	L I	ő
AM Peak (6:30-8:59) trips	1986	230802	52192	130281	0	1276	6433	29085	0	2432	452503	130281	1.23
AM Peak (6:30-8:59) trips	1995	268656	62064	78302	30389	985	7460	47063	446	1113	496477	78302	1.23
AM Peak (6:30-8:59) trips	2005	306415	02197	102930	40115	1093	9421	52485	440	1982	580701	102930	1.21
Off Book (9:00-15:29) trips	1986	402576	92187	71620	17272	2672	075/	117061	0 592	2390	726404	71620	1.23
Off-Peak (9:00-15:29) trips	2005	506834	93397	93477	23763	4997	11483	118530	499	3126	856106	93477	1.18
PM Peak (15:30-17:59) trips	1986	284831	72983	113996	0	2125	8409	32789	0	2330	517462	113996	1.26
PM Peak (15:30-17:59) trips	1995	333322	84132	73611	13150	1345	9122	59017	612	1383	575694	73611	1.25
PM Peak (15:30-17:59) trips	2005	375717	81401	103376	18286	1463	10132	61733	719	2453	655281	103376	1.22
Trips by driver's licence holders	1986	1214338	236849	219211		8268	17637	91325		6960	1794588	219211	
Trips by driver's licence holders	1995	1435679	258412	155691	5795	5974	20545	166007	2030	3612	2053745	155691	
Trips by driver's licence holders	2005	1631629	226814	213027	6526	9554	26632	188507	2026	5388	2310104	213027	
Trips by non-licence holders	1986		101901	176957		4260	9728	54873		1783	349502	176957	
Trips by non-licence holders	1995		138277	103972	55289	4066	12385	114079	271	2004	430343	103972	
Trips by non-licence holders	2005	07410	79193	10/055	9953	2888	2201	59250	164	2830	267230	200767	
Trips by transit passibilitiers	2005	8/418 153/607	212716	289707	3988 78212	3008 0778	3201	257555	104	1828	2312/04	76136	
Male trins	1986	713085	107276	170606	70212	6741	19615	64805	1994	6846	1088974	170606	
Male trips	1995	819799	118411	111685	31775	4961	24095	127282	1964	3336	1243309	111685	
Male trips	2005	866026	136674	167157	40610	5852	26658	138523	1713	4927	1388140	167157	
Female trips	1986	502638	232020	225663	-	5786	7676	81342	_	1897	1057023	225663	
Female trips	1995	615816	278141	147999	29295	5079	8885	152879	337	2280	1240711	147999	
Female trips	2005	761029	238069	199263	41809	6995	10582	160055	405	4606	1422813	199263	
Trips by males ages 11-14	1986	46	13127	24060	0	75	4005	9276	0	562	51150	24060	
Trips by males ages 11-14	1995	0	21950	7138	20443	368	4638	21004	0	324	75865	7138	
Trips by males ages 11-14	2005	0	28124	9246	26385	244	3171	20416		623	88210	9246	
Trips by females ages 11-14	1986	63	13670	24552	0	150	857	10185	0	316	49792	24552	
Trips by females ages 11-14	1995	4	20221	/603	18689	61	1592	19196	0	135	6/501	. 7603	
Trips by females ages 11-14	2005	16765	28122	10103	26526	/3	2600	18/84	39	595	84/69	10103	
Trips by males ages 15-19	1980	10705	212503	28524	1097/	211	3000	20071	0	763	971/7	28524	
Trips by males ages 15-19	2005	25866	21337	35971	12576	474	3479	20071	88	896	127514	35971	
Trips by females ages 15-19	1986	12692	17349	36143	12570	451	368	9918	0	286	77209	36143	
Trips by females ages 15-19	1995	15205	27855	21808	9558	144	568	16879	0	166	92183	21808	
Trips by females ages 15-19	2005	14838	33472	36196	13119	398	396	16215	77	520	115231	. 36196	
Trips by males ages 20-24	1986	57597	10293	18657	0	516	2362	5928	0	1100	96453	18657	
Trips by males ages 20-24	1995	55350	12296	15323	57	444	2935	14092	139	350	100985	15323	
Trips by males ages 20-24	2005	43436	11326	25914	71	562	2364	11844	157	434	96110	25914	
Trips by females ages 20-24	1986	45550	21292	30075	0	598	2301	10605	0	305	110726	30075	
Trips by females ages 20-24	1995	38572	22448	21019	137	939	1122	16408	0	241	100886	21019	
Trips by females ages 20-24	2005	33091	14555	29720	80	671	842	15071	0	511	94539	29720	
Trips by males ages 25-54	1986	480833	52249	71769	0	4837	8048	31806	1402	4073	653616	5 71769	
Trips by males ages 25-54	1995	597753	48699	59493	134	2943	11461	57995	1493	1/55	781/26	59493	
Trips by finales ages 25-54	1086	319290	42135	02606	289	3419	13050	38486	1054	1034 6/6	629461	02606	
Trips by females ages 25-54	1995	472046	145509	78033	756	2637	4770	80253	337	1293	785632	78033	
Trips by females ages 25-54	2005	485826	88103	84096	738	4291	6910	72517	174	1478	744133	84096	
Trips by males ages 55-64	1986	91809	10744	15348	0	661	1225	5372	0	328	125487	15348	
Trips by males ages 55-64	1995	78267	6520	4706	92	321	1210	7003	105	297	98521	4706	
Trips by males ages 55-64	2005	110660	7821	9109	29	666	1461	11393	224	784	142146	9109	
Trips by females ages 55-64	1986	45368	31084	18129	0	417	153	6135	0	278	101565	18129	
Trips by females ages 55-64	1995	51448	26625	6975	82	610	596	8706	0	81	95124	6975	
Trips by females ages 55-64	2005	84862	24504	11883	99	638	656	12823	15	559	136039	11883	I
Trips by males ages 65+	1986	65281	8127	11658	0	442	280	2270	0	0	88058	11658	
Trips by males ages 65+	1995	690/1	/589	4186	/5	493	291	/118	0	241	89065	4186	
Trips by males ages 65+	2005	24125	10885	5/33	0	152	926	8646	0	410	113365	5/33	
Trips by females ages 65+	1980	24125	26555	12561	0 73	927 680	227	11/127	0	363	00385	12561	
Trips by females ages 65+	2005	61085	28989	9143	/3	407	481	12364	65	699	113235	9143	
Trips under 5km (AM peak)	1995	104955	28044	5145		-07	101	12304	00	000	115255	5145	1.27
Trips under 5km (AM peak)	2005	106716	29472										1.28
Trips under 5km (MD off-peak)	1995	241424	52674										1.22
Trips under 5km (MD off-peak)	2005	259647	48348										1.19
Trips under 5km (PM peak)	1995	156113	40828										1.26
Trips under 5km (PM peak)	2005	158073	36380										1.23
Trips 5-10km (AM peak)	1995	75094	16861										1.22
Trips 5-10km (AM peak)	2005	79372	16600										1.21
Trips 5-10km (MD off-peak)	1995	94637	20710										1.22
Trips 5-10km (MD off-peak)	2005	112687	21374										1.19
Trips 5-10km (PM peak)	1995	85011	21589										1.25
Trips over 10km (AM peak)	2005	91995	17152										1.22
Trips over 10km (AM peak)	200⊑ 7332	005/8 115921	12000										1.19
Trips over 10km (MD off-neak)	1995	8709/	17887										1 71
Trips over 10km (MD off-neak)	2005	124872	20880										1.17
Trips over 10km (PM peak)	1995	92153	21714										1.24
Trips over 10km (PM peak)	2005	119689	23340										1.20

Appendix C Tables of Region-based Indicators

Table C-1: Region-based daily trips

			All trips		T	fransit trips	5
		rio	coc		Irio	oec (
Indicator (trins by home region of trin, maker)	Voar	Inta	luét	ICR	nta	tuét	CR
Work trips ago 11-14	1096	159	/21	Z 500	51	0	2 02
Work trips age 11-14	1900	210	431	240	/5	41	93 45
Work trips age 11-14	2005	1037	667	240	43	0	43
Work trips age 15-19	1986	9366	3388	12754	3368	1167	4535
Work trips age 15-19	1995	5459	2467	7946	1292	357	1649
Work trips age 15-19	2005	13873	4076	17899	4380	965	5345
Work trips age 20-24	1986	37717	11447	49164	10836	2170	13007
Work trips age 20-24	1995	21896	9409	31305	5390	1178	6568
Work trips age 20-24	2005	30391	9357	39748	9104	1811	10915
Work trips age 25-54	1086	201/06	86090	380683	50/21	8801	68312
Work trips age 25-54	1005	294400	98104	381878	//207	7583	51700
Work trips age 25-54	2005	203301	108679	422503	55256	1/635	60802
Work trips age 25-54	1096	10/120	6422	422303	0206	021	10726
Work trips age 55-64	1005	22027	5957	20207	2100	321	26/9
Work trips age 55-64	2005	40990	11612	52502	6607	1/55	9062
Work trips age 65-04	1096	40009	11015	52505	1509	1455	1500
Work trips age 65+	1960	5726	252	6220	1306	61	1046
Work trips age 65+	2005	5750	202 E00	70520	904	107	1040
0 vohiele heuseheld work trins	1006	24061	2100	2007	15940	2021	17000
0 vehicle household work trips	1960	24001	2214	20000	13049	1621	12072
0 vehicle household work trips	2005	23201	4211	20720	16251	2205	105572
1 percep bousehold work trips	1096	20024	4211	52205	10251	2505	12022
1-person household work trips	1980	45504	0220	32137	75 42	1222	13032
1-person household work trips	2005	39520	9259	61004	11012	2009	12020
1-person nousehold work trips	1096	40980	14655	01904	11012	2908	13920
1-vehicle household work trips	1005	11102010	40483	212/43 102077	40082	7414 E000	25095
1-vehicle household work trips	200L	1/0500	45014	102744	23000	0200	33330
2+ vehicle household work trips	2005	149200	44155	193/41	37005	9528	40934
2+-vehicle household work trips	1005	200150	62702	2003U4	23460	3746	15222
2+ vehicle household work trips	7992	1/2//3	03/83	230/9/	13110	2107	15223
2 person household work trips	2005	229188	80558	310282	22/90	/439	30229
2-person nousenoia work trips	1986	107000	30396	142070	26463	4010	30473
2-person nousehold work trips	1995	107660	35021	142873	18049	3237	21286
2-person household work trips	2005	123004	43640	112077	24189	6204	30393
3-person nousehold work trips	1986	86692	25770	1138//	1/533	2582	20116
3-person nousenoid work trips	1995	/1901	2/836	99737	11/80	1927	13/0/
3-person nousenoid work trips	2005	93680	31442	125205	1/5/1	4412	21983
4+-person household work trips	1986	45560	15311	61057	9893	1/16	11609
4+-person household work trips	1995	39686	11939	51624	5/14	1026	6740
4+-person nousenoid work trips	2005	42579	13165	55794	/552	1597	9149
4-person household work trips	1986	90123	30744	120912	18981	3970	22950
4-person household work trips	1995	82258	32076	114581	12031	2116	14147
4-person household work trips	2005	100555	31823	132415	16322	3951	20273
0-vehicle household trips	1986	123790	17640	141431	72988	8934	81922
0-vehicle household trips	1995	166979	32590	199568	68892	8808	77700
0-vehicle household trips	2005	170621	24729	195350	78216	9723	87939
1-vehicle household trips	1986	764170	204565	968784	148509	24432	172941
1-vehicle household trips	1995	846073	284721	1133736	102082	19083	121566
1-vehicle household trips	2005	849457	239930	1089386	129063	28308	157371
1-worker household trips	1986	554918	144132	699050	102742	14318	117060
1-worker household trips	1995	535793	167610	703403	68675	11452	80127
1-worker household trips	2005	686349	193166	879515	103961	20998	124959
2+-vehicle household trips	1986	781837	210393	1029308	81492	12574	96940
2+-vehicle household trips	1995	851641	295429	1153592	51652	8/64	60506
2+-vehicle household trips	2005	1140490	382411	1522901	9/155	23955	121110
2+-worker household trips	1986	949069	266655.9	1215/25	162670	2///1	190442
2+-worker household trips	1995	1065244	374183.8	1439428	116693	20508	137202
2+-worker household trips	2005	1106607	364260.3	1470868	152885	34344	187229
1-worker 0-vehicle household trips	1986	57734	6945	64679	33410	3097	36508
1-worker 0-vehicle household trips	1995	68201	13179	81380	27924	3886	31810
1-worker 0-vehicle household trips	2005	71664	11287	82951	34329	4643	38972
1-worker 1-venicle household trips	1986	299228	83455	382684	52812	9191	62003
1-worker 1-vehicle household trips	1992	301/95	103047	404843	33038	6455	39493
1-worker 1-venicle household trips	2005	330570	95203	425773	48445	11448	19540
1-worker 2+ vehicle household trins	1005	165707	53484	24/910	10519	2030	10049
1-worker 2+-vehicle household trins	2005	202/9/	96676	21/180	21100	1111	0024 26005
2-worker 0-yehicle household trips	1096	204113	2225	370791	1/15/0	-4907 2049	20090
2-worker 0-vehicle household trips	1005	21332	2220	20106	11575	1050	17507
2-worker 0-vehicle household trips	7332	2004/	JJJJ 2014	20100	11765	1171	12002
2-worker 1-vehicle household trips	1096	23390	2014 82002	20/93 272/01	6/212	10612	7/07/
2-worker 1-vehicle household trips	1005	20000	172000	27 340Z	/7957	0957	5771/
2-worker 1-vehicle household trips	2005	300202	Q/Q1E	285107	+7057 60700	12027	7/177
2-worker 2+-vehicle household trips	1002	300292	04013	701C0C	25720	1300/	/43// /0/75
2-worker 2+-vehicle household trips	1005	374900	1700072	-101032 6727E1	33/30	4745	40473 2011 <i>6</i>
2-worker 2+-vehicle household trins	2005	675610	1/0031	023/31 QE0703	23021 54002	4/90	50410
2-worker A-vehicle household trips	1096	020018 1000	255104	000/02 2602	34992 1705	744//	09409 2224
2-worker Overlice household tries	1005	1909	1094	5002	1495	/40	1657
2-worker Gyobicle boucebold tring	7332	2042	0	2399	1650		105/
2-worker 1-vehicle household trips	2005	3842	248	4091 E 407E	12001	8/	1/3/
2 worker 1 vehicle household trips	1005	40808	1410/	549/5	12891	2803	11107
2 worker 1 vehicle household trips	1992	43069	11209	248/8	9580	1010	1112/
2 worker 2+ vehicle household trips	2005	20/94	3261	24055	5444	48/	5931
2 worker 2+ vehicle household trips	1005	141204	30480	177652	13340	4095	23//3
S-worker 2+-venicle nousenoid trips	1992	141304	36369	124546	12319	1816	14136
5-worker 2+-venicie nousenold trips	2005	99094	32454	131548	13038	3425	16462
4+-worker 0-vehicle nousehold trips	1986	302	166	468	121	83	204
4+-worker 0-venicle nousehold trips	1995	/13	0	/13	540	0	540
4+-worker U-venicle household trips	2005	493	0	493	394	0	394
4+-worker 1-vehicle household trips	1986	11069	3362	14431	3724	602	4326
4+-worker 1-vehicle household trips	1992	/242	2855	10096	2470	405	28/5
4+-worker 1-venicle nousehold trips	2005	3011	147	3158	894	117	1011
4+-worker 2+-venicle nousenoia trips	1986	59653	15435	75088	10046	1990	12036
++-worker 2+ vehicle household trips	7992	23162	1/592	70754	2000	961	4704
	LUU2	L 2/404	/22/	J4041	5339	122	4/21

Indiantes (teins by home region of tein makes)	Veer	ntario	uébec	CR
andicator (trips by nome region of trip-maker)	109C	121764	0 46022	Z
2-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	1980	131/04	40923	1/808/
2-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	1992	125004	107107	23/1/0
2-person 1-vehicle hhld page	2005	135604	42347	72692
2-person 1-venicle hhld page	1980	54437	18240	72083
2-person 1-venicle nnid psgrs	1995	658/3	28281	94154
2-person 1-venicle nnid psgrs	2005	48028	16040	64068
3-person 1-venicle nnid drivers	1986	14210	6003	20213
3-person 1-venicle nhid drivers	1995	1/002	4437	21439
3-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	2005	8386	1405	9790
3-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	1986	7069	2942	10011
3-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	1995	9093	2976	12069
3-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	2005	3356	504	3860
3-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	1986	46658	13088	59745
3-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	1995	48590	13631	62220
3-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	2005	29475	7347	36822
3-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	1986	15285	4939	20225
3-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	1995	16243	4145	20389
3-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	2005	7241	2207	9447
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	1986	3267	1417	4684
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	1995	2302	1214	3516
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld drivers	2005	931	30	961
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	1986	2736	807	3543
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	1995	1167	568	1735
4+-person 1-vehicle hhld psgrs	2005	663	0	663
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	1986	9747	3631	13378
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	1995	12175	3671	15846
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld drivers	2005	4932	1068	6000
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	1986	4295	1796	6091
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	1995	5135	1501	6636
4+-person 2-vehicle hhld psgrs	2005	1624	380	2004
4+-person 3+-vehicle hhld drivers	1986	22462	6315	28778
4+-person 3+-vehicle hhld drivers	1995	20913	8243	29156
4+-person 3+-vehicle hhld drivers	2005	12434	3612	16046
4+-person 3+vehicle hhld psgrs	1986	6027	507	6533
4+-person 3+vehicle hhld psgrs	1995	4166	1608	5774
4+-person 3+vehicle hhld psgrs	2005	2139	1008	3146

Table C-2: Driver and passenger daily trips by household type and region

Appendix D Tables of District-based Indicators

Table D-1: District demographics

				_	Centre	Est			tittsville	ıgers			ntre	st	ier Area	st			heast	hwest	theast	thwest	t ucester /	ean	tawa	tineau	awa	ineau	Ottawa	Gatineau	rio	bec			
		a Vista	lmer yshore / darview	acon Hil	tineau C	tineau E	nt Club	de Hull	nata / Si	sson-Ar	rivale	eans	awa Cei	awa Ea:	awa Inn	awa We	iteau	ral East	ral Nort	ral Nort	ral Sout	ral Sout	ral West uth Glor	trim uth Nep	ntral Oti	ntral Ga	oan Otta	oan Gati	ourban (ourban (ral Onta	ral Quet	tario	ébec	ж
Indicator	Year	Alt	Ayl Ce	Bei	Ga	e e	른 로	Île	Kai	Ма	Ř	ē	ð	ð	ð	ð	Pla	Ru	Ru	Ru	Ru	Ru	Ru So	So Lei	Ce	Cei	5	5	Sul	Sul	Rui	Ru	ő	ð	ZC
Area (sq km)	ALL	38	96 113	22	27	57 2	8 52	11202	83	82	39	89	3	16	16	18	13	288	1029	1241	509	729	744	79 55	19	5	299	28	305	193	2270	2353	2893	2578	5471
Population	1986	72054 37	074 67240	28689	38588 2 52734 4	3897 3930 5706 4454	9 45232	10616	52372	12261	70895	56413 89669	9117	46433 6 17898 7	9292	41146	2386	3836	11943	12357	11104	15829 21275	4590 2 20177 1	113 29095	81711	11262	345736	39305	108182	97945	35359 68317	36561 51336	564769 705405	185073	749842
Population	2005	79170 40	216 80520	32514	53526 4	7742 4947	2 53934	8742	87482	23185	78550 1	08487	6443	52152 8	8368	48733	15790	11362	27928	18283	24766	24773	23278 9	442 55721	94811	8742	425573	49472	261132	157274	84179	69396	865695	284884	1150579
Population 11-14	1986	2448 2	179 3501	2003	1843	2383 153	2 1179	638	2559	801	2522	4319	36	1638	1811	1230	49	333	718	857	895	874	164	107 1221	1847	638	14521	1532	8206	6454	2266	2376	26840	11000	37840
Population 11-14	1995	3433 2	951 3334	1564	2686	2609 160	7 2801	285	3789	1256	3407	6071	172	2013	1806	1624	234	586	973	844	1152	1188	1349	25 1716	1978	285	18176	1607	11601	8480	4275	3073	36030	13445	49475
Population 11-14	2005	4476 3	243 5877	1682	3249	3637 261	0 4405	304	7152	1761	4707	9323	23	3527	3200	2510	936	947	2323	1274	1959	1888	1929	361 4447	3223	304	27184	2610	21283	11065	6723	5358	58413	19337	77750
Population 15-19	1986	4590 1	980 4680	3442	2515	2464 328	6 1802	758	2929	594	3957	4889	198	2488	2759	1475	0	317	812	1142	708	1123	401	175 1187	2957	758	22434	3286	9180	6959	2549	2548	37120	13551	50671
Population 15-19	1995	3941 2	979 4834	2362	3458	3582 284	2 3273	410	3444	1111	3982	6798	495	2546	3523	1728	312	656	938	1014	1274	1795	1561	101 1738	4018	410	22666	2842	12081	10331	5286	3063	44051	16646	60697
Population 15-19	2005	6270 1	578 5778	2301	3746	273 2213 /2/3	2 5353	1029	1635	991	6618	3060	230	3833 51/9	5770 6973	2518	291	234	31/	872	759	2329	1805	283 5002 137 669	4006	1029	32055	2752	22598	7828	2172	4514 2177	47877	15375	63252
Population 20-24	1995	4878 1	651 4981	1759	3466	2958 422	7 2823	1197	2389	1214	5707	5201	1290	3139 1	0364	2280	488	522	880	653	703	937	686	85 1065	11654	1197	25567	4227	8740	8563	2848	2747	48809	16734	65543
Population 20-24	2005	7094 2	515 6074	2597	3509	2976 404	4 4250	779	4596	1454	8931	7307	547	3785 1	1665	2745	673	724	1351	852	1326	1323	1140	428 3555	12212	779	35476	4044	15886	9673	4513	3657	68087	18153	86240
Population 25-54	1986	28917 14	674 31031	13650	20475 1	5424 1768	6 15067	4960	20139	5737	29582	32325	3661	19540 3	6155	15342	1413	2121	6815	6020	5580	8094	2513	916 8088	39816	4960	153129	17686	61468	51986	18308	18572	272721	93204	365925
Population 25-54	1995	31455 17	474 35310	13460	26810 24	4313 2146	4 22838	4700	27309	9208	30865	45091	5024	23310 3	7863	19662	4707	5000	8462	8109	8193	10150	10036	576 15711	42887	4700	176900	21464	88687	73304	33379	25779	341853	125247	467100
Population 25-54	2005	32693 18	796 35333	13698	25546 2	3735 2372	4 24780	4290	41239	10734	31939	51307	3696	23991 4	4991	21928	8914	5695	14478	8742	11482	10802	10908 5	221 28214	48687	4290	184362	23724	125981	76991	38887	33954	397917	138959	536876
Population 55-64	1986	10627 1	898 8126	3157	3229	2948 413	9 1831	1652	2177	1239	9890	2320	993	5550	6085	6807	440	256	674	1336	815	1501	401	426 616	7078	1652	45988	4139	5539	8515	2973	3249	61578	17555	79133
Population 55-64	300E	7266 4	220 /104 146 7722	2/82	5/18	2080 355	5 4205	1022	2807	2322	7565	4803	801	5125	4459 8409	3801 5160	430	80b 012	2/12/	2380	984 2447	2124	2611	220 15/2	0216	1022	33858 41020	5325	9462 21240	8/59	9105	3519 7219	53363 80700	20560	110250
Population 65+	1986	9974 1	039 7676	1696	1726	1344 314	9 1311	1309	1457	1150	9555	1111	405	7365	9501	9581	95	226	621	592	560	1359	382	118 268	9906	1309	47158	3149	2954	4204	2527	2363	62545	11025	73570
Population 65+	1995	11589 2	284 8809	2848	2792	2313 512	8 2507	1887	2617	1443	9971	3744	759	7152	8590	8198	293	720	760	1121	1182	1859	1259	110 1075	9349	1887	51074	5128	7546	7682	5020	3324	72989	18021	91010
Population 65+	2005	13022 3	395 11359	4699	5365	3772 685	4 4043	1270	7058	2230	11617	6039	984	7943 1	0145	9574	805	732	1809	1754	2389	2460	1884	631 2668	11129	1270	62257	6854	16396	13337	7465	5793	97247	27254	124501
Full-Time Labour Force	1986	27933 12	528 30789	13460	19045 1	3055 1704	4 14153	4307	16702	4868	30809	27769	4179	19725 3	4707	17540	1511	1895	5399	5263	4999	7183	2149	794 6717	38886	4307	154409	17044	51981	46139	16226	15530	261503	83020	344523
Full-Time Labour Force	1995	24465 14	326 29482	11735	21629 1	9765 1758	0 18436	3520	23588	7465	25837	38324	4516	18535 3	0517	16273	4238	4293	6800	6448	7118	8814	8157	535 13119	35033	3520	144762	17580	75665	59958	28382	20712	283843	101770	385612
Full-Time Labour Force	2005	28209 17	744 31796	12982	24915 2	2982 2261	5 22820	3683	36878	9849	29793	49493	3912	21745 4	0174	20121	8528	5017	13433	8150	10820	10531	10207 5	26208	44086	3683	167466	22615	117589	74169	36574	31432	365715	131899	497614
Labour Force	1986	34091 14	802 37197	16794	22009 1	5437 2055	8 16444	5281	19668	5563	37121	32332	4449	23128 4	0492	20472	1753	2212	5940	5999	5755	8462	2477	991 8062	44940	5281	185247	20558	61054	54001	18905	17502	310146	97343	407489
Labour Force	2005	30912 17	418 30/85	14332	26731 24	1103 2452	8 24880	4639	28250	9089	33091 4	47095 54255	3995	22078 3	39444	20240	4785	5217	8110 1//737	9037	11963	11220	11105 5	735 15810	45203	4039	185393	22247	91890	73240	35228	24973	352807	1/1986	5/13295
Part-Time Labour Force	1986	6159 2	274 6407	3334	2964	2382 351	4 2291	974	2966	695	6312	4563	269	3403	5785	2931	242	317	541	736	756	1279	328	198 1345	6054	974	30838	3514	9072	7862	2679	1972	48644	14322	62966
Part-Time Labour Force	1995	6448 3	092 7303	2598	5101	1548 466	7 4666	1119	4668	1624	7254	8772	1243	3543	8927	3967	547	924	1316	1320	1578	2412	1932	100 2691	10170	1119	35778	4667	16231	13288	6846	4261	69024	23335	92359
Part-Time Labour Force	2005	3159 1	562 3634	1237	1735	1121 191	3 2060	378	2771	794	3081	4762	83	2244	3823	2513	392	484	1305	888	1143	1033	898	360 2309	3906	378	17927	1913	10203	4810	3558	2986	35594	10087	45681
Employment	1986	45986	0 24169	9361	0	0	0 13428	0	10435	0	38789	7860	79203	19876 5	4722	29329	0	517	0	0	2643	3325	1088	869 1646	133925	0	180938	0	20810	0	7573	0	343246	0	343246
Employment (1996 in Gatineau)	1995	52638 6	085 28456	13491	12775	9115 2159	9 15934	26287	18867	5625	48503	14468	77732	21649 5	7477	31547	199	1436	1225	2340	4355	4407	5809 1	555 3611	135209	26287	212218	21599	38501	28174	16007	9190	401935	85250	487185
Employment	2005	212	243 37895 172 150	21052	16213	9//4 314/ 91 1/	0 18/3/	25123	43598	5162	53941 : 00	216	96977	24443 6	157	35074	1838	2263	2405	2425	4312	20	4301 5	//1 /240	15/923	25123	263183	314/0	76048	36068	16939	9992	514093 1762	102653	616/46 2457
Female workers 15-19	1985	75	44 63	250	21	83 6	2 0	23	26	39	42	73	0	69	62	0	0	13	24	36	17	14	10	0 0	62	92 23	274	62	99	148	44	99	479	332	2457
Female workers 15-19	2005	124	98 102	88	98	92 11	8 58	17	396	35	52	122	0	44	29	24	10	37	66	0	20	0	0	18 216	29	17	492	118	752	298	57	101	1330	534	1864
Female workers 20-24	1986	1487	512 1595	474	1212	825 122	3 800	266	627	345	1906	834	36	1397	1985	1257	98	45	206	229	263	252	55	84 120	2021	266	8916	1223	1665	2647	615	780	13217	4916	18133
Female workers 20-24	1995	770	261 851	424	823	616 62	6 491	175	482	316	667	837	129	544	1226	370	98	76	263	133	111	138	70	25 119	1355	175	4117	626	1463	1798	395	712	7330	3311	10641
Female workers 20-24	2005	1014	355 1107	268	659	588 75	8 650	157	807	319	1287	1263	110	867	1633	558	109	103	333	187	269	281	268	62 555	1743	157	5751	758	2687	1711	921	839	11102	3465	14567
Female workers 25-54	1986	8243 4	285 8921	4275	6060	3874 546	2 4638	1224	4830	1267	9227	8705	1753	6480 1	3092	5662	680	559	1650	1663	1319	2072	692	215 2036	14845	1224	47446	5462	15786	14899	4642	4580	82719	26165	108884
Female workers 25-54	2005	8972 5	481 10642	4631	8628	3060 677	5 6812 0 0202	1055	12014	2773	9310	14694	1472	7037 1 9011 1	2079	5030	2662	1561	2519	2420	2505	3143	2970	245 4981	13304	1055	53434 61602	6775 8770	28594	23849	10179	11775	105511	39391 51690	144902
Female workers 55-64	1986	1307	85 1087	463	348	164 34	3 354	212	260	79	1211	221	74	563	1160	678	196	1557	70	111	139	123	18	0 182	1234	212	5663	343	663	793	295	260	7855	1608	9463
Female workers 55-64	1995	870	287 1002	334	370	200 45	1 476	109	319	135	1264	618	97	521	720	453	156	102	80	111	122	166	126	10 116	817	109	4920	451	1063	1013	516	326	7316	1899	9215
Female workers 55-64	2005	1216	650 1515	987	1068	651 102	4 758	154	1305	201	1284	1809	219	1094	1793	957	272	64	246	345	354	545	383	218 616	2012	154	7811	1024	3948	2641	1346	792	15117	4611	19728
Female workers 65+	1986	36	0 181	67	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	128	0	0	41	163	69	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	0 0	163	0	522	0	0	0	33	0	718	0	718
Female workers 65+	1995	155	70 174	94	41	24	0 170	0	92	0	220	218	38	228	334	104	20	38	6	16	52	57	22	0 69	372	0	1145	0	379	155	169	22	2065	177	2242
Male workers 15-19	2005	102	1/ 14 67 159	9/	39 124	52 4	ษ 45 ก วา	0	56	14 22	86	250	40	79	/8 117	132	0	60	4/	43	34 75	34 107	25	2/ 54	118	0	5/9	200	223	108	242	297	1013	261	2424
Male workers 15-19	1995	26	19 21	252	103	173 4	4 27	42	59	19	0	69	0	45	70	90 0	20	6	51	31	47	26	0	20 0	70	42	119	44	148	315	79	101	416	502	918
Male workers 15-19	2005	140	140 160	120	244	232 4	4 113	0	322	79	294	403	0	161	27	21	41	63	184	66	161	163	111	6 188	27	0	1009	44	919	657	498	329	2453	1030	3483
Male workers 20-24	1986	1168	609 1553	607	1079	431 83	9 725	183	385	219	1720	938	217	1168	1315	1384	0	68	19	359	327	253	73	27 62	1532	183	8325	839	1412	2119	721	597	11990	3738	15728
Male workers 20-24	1995	729	310 923	368	765	574 76	7 445	336	702	297	645	894	210	452	1236	431	176	115	244	152	194	207	218	10 239	1446	336	3993	767	1845	1825	734	693	8018	3621	11639
Male workers 20-24	2005	1045	571 1229	519	666	892 100	4 753	94	837	431	1745	1460	85	777	1532	588	189	88	349	240	341	325	360	168 819	1617	94	6656	1004	3284	2318	1114	1020	12671	4436	17107
Male workers 25-54	1986	12215 6	391 13901	5699	8796	5603 764	3 6876	2029	9639	2462	13326	15546	1689	7833 1	4293	6013	489	996	3093	2365	2595	3899	1147	423 3859	15982	2029	65863	7643	29467	22279	8637	7920	119949	39871	159820
Male workers 25-54	1995	11204 7	106 14056	5097	10126	3494 810	9295	1647	12126	3604	12124	19093	2141	8698 1	3800	8033	2012	2128	3338	3243	3//3	4466	4319	230 7148	15941	1647	68275	8107	38597	28/38	14686	10185	137499	48677	186176
Male workers 55-64	1986	2830	326 27/9	1258	1197	961 05	5 9963 6 510	7322	18298	44/4 <u></u> 18	2876	22045 10/17	222	9089 1	.0014 1819	2128	3923 AQ	2514	161	3584	5341 150	386	4821 2	46 270	20380	242	13898	90/5	21/1	32559	766	14082 956	18851	26871	224495
Male workers 55-64	1995	1165	593 1606	672	711	519 62	3 557	112	899	262	1441	1491	316	783	877	729	59	204	236	265	227	489	365	75 353	1193	112	6953	623	2818	1882	1285	763	12249	3380	15629
Male workers 55-64	2005	1609	938 1824	829	1364	965 114	6 1071	104	1760	392	1700	2680	266	1518	2198	1190	284	210	610	683	558	722	634	311 930	2464	104	9741	1146	5681	3551	2124	1685	20010	6486	26496
Male workers 65+	1986	188	47 193	125	41	0 7	3 66	59	15	0	204	0	111	146	421	186	0	0	40	0	56	30	18	0 0	532	59	1108	73	15	88	104	40	1759	260	2019
Male workers 65+	1995	496	134 145	90	41	23 10	5 143	21	205	19	355	337	113	158	316	123	20	51	39	42	70	99	67	20 91	429	21	1510	105	653	218	287	100	2879	444	3323
Male workers 65+	2005	130	34 212	52	108	135 6	7 17	31	184	32	283	213	63	104	392	282	39	0	39	36	108	79	109	23 163	455	31	1080	67	583	316	296	107	2414	521	2935

Indicator	Year	Alta Vista	Aylmer	Bayshore / Cedarview	Beacon Hill	Gatineau Centre	Gatineau Est	Hull Périphérie	Hunt Club	Île de Hull	Kanata / Stittsville	Masson-Angers	Merivale	Orleans	Ottawa Centre	Ottawa East	Ottawa Inner Area	Ottawa West	Plateau	Rural East	Rural Northeast	Rural Northwest	Rural Southeast	Rural Southwest	Rural West	South Gloucester / Leitrim	South Nepean	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Ontario	Québec	NCR
Students resident	1986	11041	4392	10182	6645	5437	5143	6041	3856	1565	6519	1572	9180	10201	850	5871	10022	3781	242	651	1492	1851	1659	2230	564	351	3132	10872	1565	50556	6041	20203	15214	5104	4915	86735	27735	114470
Students resident	1995	14047	7630	14386	5913	9031	8458	8481	9828	1683	9580	2905	14286	18582	2399	8244	19068	6839	1465	1585	2567	2427	2806	3679	3583	196	5293	21467	1683	73543	8481	33651	26584	11653	7899	140314	44647	184961
Students resident	2005	16235	7296	14338	5536	8452	7284	7478	11354	1143	13901	3633	15710	22156	672	9110	17608	6382	1953	2044	3926	2147	3450	4101	3566	770	10011	18280	1143	78664	7478	46838	24985	13162	9706	156944	43312	200256
Students 11-14	1986	2448	2179	3501	2003	1843	2383	1499	1179	638	2559	785	2522	4319	36	1595	1774	1230	49	333	718	857	895	874	164	107	1180	1810	638	14478	1499	8165	6454	2266	2360	26719	10951	37670
Students 11-14	1995	3433	2951	3334	1564	2686	2609	1607	2801	285	3779	1256	3407	6071	172	2013	1806	1624	234	573	973	840	1152	1188	1349	25	1716	1978	285	18176	1607	11591	8480	4262	3069	36007	13441	49448
Students 11-14	2005	3731	2678	4550	1336	2737	2898	2168	3441	235	5519	1450	3680	7657	0	2926	2505	1887	718	719	1797	937	1337	1371	1512	254	3598	2505	235	21551	2168	17028	9031	4939	4184	46023	15618	61641
Students 15-19	1986	4075	1680	4033	3116	2079	1987	2494	1557	423	2768	485	3656	4457	161	1996	2396	1314	0	227	612	884	557	1031	364	175	1156	2557	423	19747	2494	8556	5746	2179	1981	33039	10644	43683
Students 15-19	1995	3628	2564	4602	2270	3160	3151	2569	3120	258	3250	894	3830	6515	495	2253	3112	1684	273	605	812	873	1152	1714	1458	101	1694	3607	258	21387	2569	11560	9148	4929	2579	41483	14554	56037
Students 15-19	2005	6160	3074	5375	2106	3612	2897	2466	4920	269	5220	1437	5404	9977	230	3468	3648	2402	800	918	1575	784	1589	2057	1593	254	4369	3878	269	29835	2466	19820	10383	6157	3796	59690	16914	76604
Students 20-24	1986	3200	296	1707	1236	1038	435	1559	757	330	444	157	2142	1037	614	1586	3241	690	144	91	70	55	94	278	18	27	426	3855	330	11318	1559	1934	1913	481	282	17588	4084	21672
Students 20-24	1995	2969	769	2611	925	1174	974	2223	1525	572	1083	255	3654	2930	967	1352	7249	1072	215	197	235	220	258	442	314	25	640	8216	572	14108	2223	4678	3132	1211	710	28213	6637	34850
Students 20-24	2005	4352	1079	2837	1596	1577	1113	1842	2425	322	2374	338	4994	3448	315	1505	7525	1267	301	343	345	281	460	498	306	153	1733	7840	322	18976	1842	7708	4070	1607	964	36131	7198	43329
Students 25-54	1986	1175	157	748	228	379	256	456	363	115	662	129	813	338	39	694	2611	298	49	0	73	55	75	31	18	42	370	2650	115	4319	456	1412	841	124	257	8505	1669	10174
Students 25-54	1995	3579	1304	3408	1040	1911	1701	2061	2322	547	1361	500	3259	2816	727	2532	6604	2332	723	197	535	472	215	294	462	40	1199	7331	547	18472	2061	5416	5639	1168	1507	32387	9754	42141
Students 25-54	2005	1939	453	1576	497	526	376	1001	554	317	789	408	1577	1074	128	1211	3888	812	135	64	209	125	64	175	156	109	312	4016	317	8166	1001	2284	1490	459	742	14925	3550	18475
Students 55-64	1986	108	40	135	31	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	15	0	0	0	78	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	352	0	83	40	38	0	473	40	513
Students 55-64	1995	279	21	286	0	62	23	21	20	21	75	0	136	72	38	72	139	62	0	13	0	13	23	7	0	0	44	177	21	855	21	191	106	43	13	1266	161	1427
Students 55-64	2005	35	12	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	54	0	0	0	43	15	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	43	0	118	0	0	12	0	20	161	32	193
Students 65+	1986	35	40	58	31	98	82	33	0	59	18	16	47	35	0	0	0	171	0	0	19	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	59	342	33	53	220	16	35	411	347	758
Students 65+	1995	159	21	145	114	38	0	0	40	0	32	0	0	178	0	22	158	65	20	0	12	9	6	34	0	5	0	158	0	545	0	215	79	40	21	958	100	1058
Students 65+	2005	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17
Non worker/students resident	1986	22735	5773	17958	5510	9190	7375	11804	4897	4284	6364	4089	20610	8857	1280	16564	18811	16248	438	906	2951	3672	2372	4023	1166	666	1989	20091	4284	104521	11804	17876	22776	8466	10712	150954	49576	200529
Non worker/students resident	1995	26229	10209	24200	8200	15411	13426	14428	11342	4552	12672	6141	23449	20961	1593	17073	18662	14708	2012	2886	4965	4932	4398	5673	5465	481	6856	20255	4552	125203	14428	40970	41058	18422	16038	204850	76075	280925
Non worker/students resident	2005	31567	13614	30753	12760	18424	16356	17467	17700	3537	33931	8909	29966	32077	1775	19054	26764	19716	4917	3817	9265	7098	9353	9108	8607	3302	17192	28539	3537	161516	17467	86502	53311	30885	25272	307442	99587	407029

Table D-2: District household properties

Indicator	Year	Alta Vista	Aylmer Bayshore / Cedarview	Beacon Hill	Gatineau Centre	Gatineau Est	Hull Périphérie	Hunt Club Ìle de Hull	Kanata / Stittsville	Masson-Angers	Merivale	Orleans	Ottawa Centre	Ottawa East Ottawa Inner Area	Ottawa West	Plateau	Rural East	Rural Northeast	Rural Northwest	Rural Southeast	Rural Southwest	South Gloucester / Leitrim	South Nepean	Central Ottawa	Central Gatineau	Urban Ottawa	Urban Gatineau	Suburban Ottawa	Suburban Gatineau	Rural Ontario	Rural Quebec	Ontario	Québec	NCR
Licensed drivers resident	1986	48505 1	18104 4749	7 20274	4 25800	19830	25601 19	701 6044	25407	8069	48557 3	8217 47	56 30	939 45880	29107	2046	2868	8173	8388	7698 11	727 338	8 1650	9705	50636	6044	244580	25601	74979	65780	25680	24630	395875	122056	517931
Licensed drivers resident	1995	45488 2	1858 4842	7 1872	7 33928	30083	29643 28	039 5645	34884	12148	46662 5	7848 63	45 29	276 48974	28390	5703	7064	10748 1	10711	11236 14	894 1300	5 1010	19150	55319	5645	245007	29643	112892	91572	46200	33607	459418	160468	619885
Licensed drivers resident	2005	52663 2	27319 5340	5 22311	1 37371	32918	34484 35	853 5395	58701	16205	54412 7	4163 50	78 33	232 63475	34086	11218	8126	20043 1	13257	17691 18	120 1679	5 7126	38118	68553	5395	285963	34484	178108	108826	60732	49505	593356	198211	791567
Licensed drivers working	1986	30200 1	13537 3428	3 15062	2 19891	14450	18528 15	279 4162	18798	5436	32799 3	0270 35	22 19	749 33122	18121	1655	2166	5855	5781	5605 8	154 238	6 972	7522	36644	4162	165494	18528	57562	49532	18311	17073	278010	89296	367306
Licensed drivers working	1995	27878 1	16011 3330	4 12870	25186	23067	20342 21	238 3846	27065	8685	29877 4	4923 48	28 19	038 33589	18355	4629	5141	7838	7538	8463 10	941 973	1 699	15289	38417	3846	162560	20342	87976	68892	34276	24061	323229	117141	440370
Licensed drivers working	2005	28092 1	17989 3223	7 12945	5 25030	22960	22109 23	476 3311	38323	10237	30229 5	1710 33	37 20	660 39337	20511	8626	5277	14413	8816	11721 11	355 1084	7 5286	27328	42674	3311	168150	22109	122646	74605	39201	33466	372671	133490	506161
Licensed FT workers	1986	25182 1	1834 2911	8 12354	4 17394	12492	15674 13	499 3527	16048	4790	27830 2	6508 34	50 17	125 28923	15665	1462	1850	5355	5118	4868 7	030 209	4 794	6363	32373	3527	140773	15674	49712	43182	15842	15263	238701	77646	316347
Licensed FT workers	1995	22/55 1	13601 2732	7 10944	4 20746	19084	16521 1/	361 2992 915 3115	23007	/303	23/42 3	5816 37	95 16	562 26683	14936	41/9	4242	6618 12241	5325	7031 8 10653 10	719 802	4 615	12864	30478	2992	153627	16521	/3302	57610	28016	20246	265422	97369	362791
Licensed PT workers	1986	5018	1702 516	5 2709	23302	1958	20012 21	780 635	2751	646	/969	3761	72 2	62/ /100	2457	193	317	500	663	737 1	12/ 20	1 179	1159	/270	635	24720	20012	7850	6350	2/69	1810	39309	116/19	50959
Licensed PT workers	1995	5122	2410 597	7 1926	5 4440	3983	3821 3	730 033 877 854	4058	1382	6135	8107 10	12 2	476 6906	3419	449	898	1220	1214	1432 2	222 170	7 85	2425	7939	854	24720	3871	14675	11282	6260	3815	57807	19772	77579
Licensed PT workers	2005	2507	1347 304	6 1021	1 1468	936	1496 1	661 195	2582	717	2538	4015	53 1	557 3036	2141	365	382	1172	817	1069 1	012 80	8 360	2081	3089	195	14471	1496	9039	4117	3270	2706	29870	8515	38384
Licensed students	1986	5200	1153 388	4 2651	1 1965	1061	2619 1	756 445	2246	413	3998	3168 5	78 2	942 5744	1362	144	226	342	484	450	754 10	9 164	1158	6321	445	21793	2619	6736	4324	1540	1240	36390	8627	45017
Licensed students	1995	6585	2569 675	5 2722	2 3999	3737	4902 4	209 940	3928	871	7581	8671 16	35 3	575 12914	3746	977	720	1020	999	1056 1	587 132	8 140	2220	14549	940	35172	4902	14959	11281	4690	2891	69371	20014	89385
Licensed students	2005	7030	2457 450	3 2339	2688	2149	3055 4	111 544	4705	1294	7658	7521 5	10 2	720 10707	2401	580	818	978	627	1307 1	543 112	9 380	3842	11217	544	30763	3055	16448	7873	4797	2900	63224	14372	77596
Licensed non-worker/students	1986	15259	3970 1115	6 3712	2 4770	4654	5650 3	405 1708	5234	2315	13606	6106 8	38 9	447 8979	10186	342	626	2187	2291	1793 3	155 94	7 598	1467	9817	1708	66772	5650	13405	13736	6521	6793	96515	27886	124402
Licensed non-worker/students	1995	14055	4785 1186	1 4471	1 7335	5629	7034 5	075 1447	6095	2996	12882	9134 6	89 8	118 7987	8247	723	1586	2468	2674	2296 3	274 265	9 265	3089	8676	1447	64708	7034	18584	18472	9815	8138	101783	35090	136873
Licensed non-worker/students	2005	17542	6874 1666	5 7026	5 9653	7809	9321 8	266 1541	15674	4674	16525 1	4932 12	31 9	852 13432	11174	2012	2031	4652	3814	4663 5	221 481	9 1460	6948	14663	1541	87050	9321	39014	26348	16734	13140	157461	50349	207810
Transit pass holders	2005	17807	6434 1385	8 7075	5 6715	5165	8516 11	499 1609	10047	1187	13396 2	5067 15	50 11	810 14564	8362	3266	951	1261	526	1109	696 71	2 548	7953	16115	1609	83806	8516	43615	21581	3467	2974	147003	34681	181684
All households	1986	28729	9251 2635	3 10343	3 13797	10531	17229 10	030 5051	12450	4695	27063 1	8489 39	95 20	475 35786	19399	1098	1320	4254	4592	3824 5	413 170	2 809	4670	39781	5051	142392	17229	36418	34677	12259	13541	230850	70498	301348
All households	1995	30038 1	12049 2970	0 11041	1 19337	16626	20165 15	709 5535	16946	7000	28386 2	8088 51	50 22	134 37607	20458	3300	3375	5783	5772	5394 7	111 651	5 471	9521	42757	5535	157466	20165	55026	51312	22395	18555	277644	95567	373211
All households	2005	33200 1	4252 3147	4 13776	5 22500	18763	24749 19	841 4793	30762	9405	32296 3	7281 45	35 24	599 44209	23177	5947	3955	9791	7250	8533 8	644 810	5 3920	19645	48744	4793	178363	24749	91608	61462	29237	26446	347952	117450	465402
0-vehicle households	1986	4064	395 290	8 647	7 1493	678	2641	458 1729	172	388	3517	290 16	24 4	000 12232	3568	42	58	120	158	71	56 1	8 0	115	13856	1729	19162	2641	577	2608	203	666	33798	7644	41442
0-vehicle households	1995	6181	1056 400	9 1330	1721	1341	3855 1	312 23/4	327	474	4171	997 20	88 5	/00 151/2	4473	1/6	115	143	219	128	152 18	8 5	166	17260	2374	2/1/6	3855	1495	4294	583	836	46514	11359	57873
U-venicie nousenoids	2005	5/68	958 344	/ 1534	2 2144	1142	3992 1	482 1684	869	350	4358	829 18	6 6	199 15390	4497	159	1/	55	105	107	91 4	/ 0	340	1/201	1684	2/283	3992	2038	4403	262	510	46784	10589	5/3/3
1-vehicle households	1986	15213	4442 1378	0 554:	3 7417	5238	9544 4	827 2803	4769	2308	14546	9110 16	84 11	468 17340	10060	660	321	1585	1635	935 1	513 43	5 305	2062	19024	2803	75437	9544	16246	17757	3204	5528	113911	35632	149543
1-vehicle households	1995	15882	5002 1549	1 057. c 757.	1 10165	7953	11308 8	410 2585 220 2475	10742	3489	14893 1	2/4/ 20	25 12	425 22224	11495	1992	943	1975	2211	1380 1	/UZ 232	1 135	3830	19582	2585	85075	11308	22885	25850	6352	/0/5	153894	4/4/8	181372
1-vehicle households	1096	7502	2655 740	0 /5/4	20105	2/90	13546 9	339 24/5 972 462	5456	3078	6672	7069 5	30 12	425 22324	12311	205	703	2/12	1969	1052 2	291 06	3 1117	2121	24754 5500	2475	91006	13546	33005	2/384	55/3	8529	62270	21201	206932
2-vehicle households	1960	7302	A711 070	4 519: c 3769	6022	5469	4094 5	0/5 402 241 E00	9750	2742	7690 1	7006 3	04 5	642 A020	4500	1025	1720	2000	2742	2050 2	201 90	1 249	4740	5399	402	37035	4094	14094	19206	3735	05500 0551	05279	21291	04570 114005
2-vehicle households	2005	8055	5840 1048	9 /019	8 8478	7767	6044 7	753 602	16245	4783	9670 1	7800 2	91 5	043 4838	5299	2123	22/0	5290	3986	15/19 /	906 /53	23/8	10669	6176	602	50366	6044	47062	2/208	16234	13559	119838	AAA13	164251
3-vehicle households	1986	1529	351 166	3 633	3 992	928	640	610 58	1335	371	1376	1585 1	82	682 655	1055	0	2240	283	544	514	938 14	5 116	156	837	58	7548	640	3192	22200	1845	1198	13422	4167	17589
3-vehicle households	1995	637	534 111	2 320	1 880	840	471	678 66	1289	235	1379	1554	0	454 519	592	59	408	465	489	604 1	067 51	2 165	616	519	66	5172	471	3674	2313	2591	1189	11906	4039	15945
3-vehicle households	2005	1396	1194 157	2 539	5 1429	1628	927 1	110 32	2336	913	1635	2812	0	706 510	794	202	751	1160	732	1576 1	353 133	1 318	1587	510	32	7748	927	7053	4453	5011	2805	20322	8217	28539
4+vehicle households	1986	421	354 46	2 326	5 84	198	349	261 0	648	149	676	437	0	369 399	355	0	125	200	320	292	494 10	8 137	162	399	0	2870	349	1384	636	1019	669	5672	1654	7326
4+vehicle households	1995	220	86 30	0 50	125	308	132	68 0	404	58	264	268	0	6 121	192	39	172	113	111	228	348 21	9 0	161	121	0	1100	132	833	558	967	282	3021	972	3993
4+vehicle households	2005	210	343 45	0 118	3 283	373	238	155 0	569	182	561	619	0	188 102	276	12	243	575	288	569	727 61	5 138	463	102	0	1958	238	1789	1011	2154	1045	6003	2294	8297
1-person households	1986	7100	530 546	7 1341	1 1858	1316	3266 1	300 1572	790	628	5837	563 21	.91 5	800 15647	5802	177	117	453	581	451	397 5	4 127	311	17838	1572	32647	3266	1791	3881	1019	1662	53295	10381	63676
1-person households	1995	8033	1468 685	8 1910	3295	2286	6238 2	222 2411	1462	1355	6432	1824 24	60 7	397 16500	8094	586	306	646	874	588	730 66	9 66	662	18960	2411	40946	6238	4014	7635	2293	2875	66213	19159	85372
1-person households	2005	9997	2855 774	2 3132	2 5483	3820	9652 3	750 2642	3665	1947	8617	3762 31	.15 8	928 20309	9452	1542	296	1381	1574	1016 1	043 95	0 544	1827	23424	2642	51618	9652	9798	13700	3305	4902	88145	30896	119041
2-person households	1986	10838	3220 917	8 2819	9 4574	3033	6378 3	357 1630	3597	1599	10847	4715 14	99 8	009 11147	8469	614	335	1397	1498	1069 1	893 61	6 234	1278	12646	1630	53517	6378	9824	11441	3913	4494	79900	23943	103843
2-person households	1995	11215	3456 1026	0 4301	1 6418	5189	7547 4	975 2004	5279	2009	10533	7738 20	06 8	237 12973	7021	1289	1115	2090	2050	1518 2	345 207	4 135	3139	14979	2004	56542	7547	16291	16352	7052	6149	94864	32052	126916
2-person households	2005	12745	4968 1180	1 5522	2 8305	6626	8378 7	063 1233	10632	3368	11683 1	2910 11	.43 8	666 14618	7432	2035	1407	3667	2768	3042 3	513 305	0 1550	5640	15761	1233	64912	8378	30732	21934	11012	9803	122417	41348	163765
3-person households	1986	5091	1893 549	0 2432	2 3108	2207	3606 2	310 1046	3086	927	4665	4272 2	23 3	416 4493	2452	88	335	726	842	654 1	302 34	4 142	1000	4716	1046	25856	3606	8500	7296	2635	2495	41707	14443	56150
3-person households	1995	4792	2530 518	8 2421	1 3730	4012	3235 3	032 594	3773	1540	5222	6425 3	92 3	535 4072	2632	898	713	1271	1221	1085 1	456 109	5 99	1881	4464	594	26822	3235	12178	11170	4349	4032	47813	19031	66844
3-person households	2005	4614	2671 554	4 2223	3 4201	3478	3307 3	624 456	6154	1861	6060	7792 2	05 3	861 5073	3290	1082	736	1840	1324	1631 1	620 165	1 771	4885	5278	456	29216	3307	19602	11432	5638	5025	59734	20220	79954
4-person households	1986	3687	253/ 4//	6 2504	4 3397	2843	2384 2	044 449	3405	1068	3977	6237 0400	41 Z	115 2925 910 2941	1780	219	299	1135	11//	1008 1	160 47	1 123	1636	2966	249	20883	2384	11401	8996	2938	3380	38188	15209	53397
4-person households	1995	3/12	2/30 404	5 1/7:	4510	3975	24/4 5	917 540 472 361	4069	1747	2050	0400	10 2	019 2041 019 0170	2210	061	1052	1245	067	1950 1	521 162	00 00	2007	2922	261	21/00	24/4	15524	10456	5051	2922	43003	19015	72905
4-person households	1096	2012	2574 457	2 12/	7 960	1122	2590 5	4/2 501 010 254	1572	1/4/	1727	9451 2702	40 Z	210 51/5 125 1574	2510	901	224	5/2	101	642	661 21	2 745 7 192	3594	1615	254	22496	1505	25067	2062	1754	4000	17760	6522	72095
5+person households	1995	2013	1865 274	9 636	5 1576	1166	671 1	563 178	23/13	536	2027	3613 2	11 1	146 1221	961	215	426	533	494	727	885 103	7 103	972	1/132	178	11368	671	7019	/822	3070	1564	22889	7235	30124
5+person households	2005	1843	1184 181	1 929	R 1199	1230	1022 1	932 101	2345	482	1986	3366	24	926 1036	693	327	464	809	617	985	937 82	2 312	1899	1060	101	10119	1022	8389	3940	3208	1908	22005	6971	29747
1-person hhld workers/vehicle	1986	1.21	1.21 1.0	6 1.68	3 1.17	1.26	0.99 1	.19 0.74	2.35	1.59	0.88	1.21 0.	51 1	.12 0.83	1.35	0.90	1.62	2.23	2.30	1.99	.85 0.9	9 1.83	1.44	0.67	0.74	1.21	0.99	1.71	1.14	1.86	2.04	1.36	1.23	1.30
1-person hhld workers/vehicle	1995	1.72	1.81 1.4	4 1.58	3 1.45	1.69	1.25 1	.30 0.91	1.64	1.85	1.38	1.43 0.	56 1	.11 0.78	1.44	1.18	2.89	2.26	2.18	2.87	.13 2.9	6 1.87	1.52	0.67	0.91	1.42	1.25	1.62	1.53	2.71	2.10	1.61	1.45	1.53
1-person hhld workers/vehicle	2005	1.95	1.75 1.8	7 1.82	2 1.73	1.78	1.66 1	l.55 1.15	2.00	2.94	1.85	1.85 0.	85 1	.51 0.93	1.73	1.37	3.97	2.07	2.72	2.74	.93 2.8	3 1.79	1.89	0.89	1.15	1.75	1.66	1.88	1.66	3.12	2.58	1.91	1.76	1.84
2-person hhld workers/vehicle	1986	1.40	1.09 1.1	3 0.98	8 0.97	1.03	1.27 1	.00 0.97	1.26	1.41	1.13	1.01 0.	84 1	.10 0.76	1.35	0.71	1.41	1.13	1.41	1.50	52 1.6	4 6.12	0.89	0.80	0.97	1.16	1.27	2.32	0.95	1.52	1.32	1.45	1.13	1.29
2-person hhld workers/vehicle	1995	1.27	1.25 1.2	0 1.13	3 1.11	1.05	1.09 1	l.07 0.92	1.20	1.35	1.31	1.15 0.	66 1	.07 0.77	1.24	0.96	1.61	1.54	1.53	1.60	77 1.4	2 1.51	1.18	0.72	0.92	1.19	1.09	1.26	1.09	1.60	1.47	1.19	1.14	1.17
2-person hhld workers/vehicle	2005	1.38	1.39 1.4	8 1.49	9 1.33	1.34	1.23 1	.42 0.90	1.71	1.67	1.56	1.47 0.	72 1	.18 0.81	1.18	0.89	2.15	1.49	1.53	1.92	2.08 2.0	4 1.47	1.37	0.76	0.90	1.38	1.23	1.51	1.24	2.05	1.57	1.43	1.23	1.33
3-person hhld workers/vehicle	1986	0.98	0.98 0.9	3 0.95	5 0.82	1.02	0.98 0	0.90 0.65	1.10	1.24	0.95	0.92 1.	27 C	0.95 0.82	0.95	0.90	1.02	0.90	1.24	1.36	12 1.2	6 1.87	1.02	1.04	0.65	0.94	0.98	1.23	0.93	1.19	1.12	1.10	0.92	1.01
3-person hhld workers/vehicle	1995	0.97	1.01 0.9	8 0.93	3 0.98	0.99	0.90 0	0.89 0.73	1.08	0.98	1.04	0.91 0.	70 C	0.85 0.73	1.01	0.97	1.29	1.15	1.20	1.18	32 1.0	0 1.24	1.01	0.72	0.73	0.95	0.90	1.06	0.99	1.20	1.11	0.98	0.93	0.96
3-person hhld workers/vehicle	2005	1.11	1.00 0.9	4 0.98	8 1.10	1.19	0.97 (0.99 0.75	1.19	1.27	1.05	1.03 0.	54 C	0.88 0.74	1.02	0.87	1.40	1.16	1.30	1.33	44 1.4	6 1.21	1.14	0.64	0.75	1.00	0.97	1.14	1.04	1.41	1.24	1.05	1.00	1.02
4-person hhld workers/vehicle	1986	0.89	0.82 0.7	9 0.85	5 0.68	1.00	0.93 (0.92 0.46	1.07	1.10	0.80	0.87 2.	26 0	0.87 0.81	0.91	1.19	1.15	1.47	1.51	1.25	26 1.1	5 1.44	0.87	1.54	0.46	0.86	0.93	1.06	0.92	1.20	1.36	1.17	0.92	1.04
4-person hhld workers/vehicle	1995	0.92	0.86 0.9	6 0.96	5 0.93	0.90	0.86 0	0.86 0.75	1.06	0.99	0.91	0.89 0.	42 0	0.90 0.81	0.81	0.73	1.19	1.18	1.23	1.13	22 1.1	0 1.29	1.03	0.62	0.75	0.90	0.86	1.07	0.86	1.16	1.14	0.94	0.90	0.92
4-person hhld workers/vehicle	2005	0.90	1.00 0.9	8 1.0:	3 1.00	1.06	1.03 1	0.71	1.10	1.16	1.05	0.95 0.	24 0	0.84 0.73	0.91	0.85	1.33	1.16	1.36	1.27	.24 1.1	/ 1.28	1.14	0.49	0.71	0.96	1.03	1.12	0.98	1.25	1.23	0.95	0.99	0.97
5+person hhid workers/vehicle	1986	0.72	1.03 0.9	9 0.74	4 0.82	1.05	0.94 0	0.84 0.71	1.15	1.39	0.79	0.92 0.	38 U	02 0.59	0.92	0.00	1.46	1.38	1.99	1.09	.36 1.5	5 1.44	0.90	0.48	0.71	0.84	0.94	1.10	0.73	1.37	1.59	0.95	0.99	0.97
5+person hhid workers/vehicle	2005	0.88	1.07 1.0	3 0.74	4 0.92	1.02	0.98 0	1.87 1.00	1.06	1.00	1.07	0.90 0.	62 0	.02 0.74	0.93	0.75	1.29	1.17	1.14	1.12	20 1.2	1.85	0.88	0.73	1.00	0.92	0.98	1.17	1.05	1.21	1.10	1.01	0.99	1.00
Anartment households	1986	9867	908 720	6 2201	1 2072	1585	7485 1	344 3653	221	1.50	8176	549 24	56 Q	0.78	7522	Q130	20	170	220	142		- 1.55 0	1.00	23850	2652	45584	7485	066	6005	287	924	70687	17066	87752
Apartment households	2005	9738	1379 696	8 2864	5 5105	2495	8361 2	353 2671	12/10	803	7235	1106 25	88 0	996 22795	7/10	984	2.9	335	186	218	187 2	1 7	350	27373	2671	46466	8361	2721	9863	467	1324	77027	22219	99246
Row/townhouse households	1986	4178	869 497	6 22/0	9 1062	571	738 /	039 521	1804	176	2651	2723	41 2	813 23783	536	447	66	87	25	26	57	- / 0 0	505	2813	531	21442	738	5032	2945	149	288	29436	4502	33938
Row/townhouse households	2005	3967	931 600	7 324	9 1934	591	1547 6	226 103	6274	485	3675	6369 3	23 3	597 4960	1705	454	82	120	55	291	116 16	1 655	5277	5283	103	28426	1547	18575	3910	650	660	52934	6220	59154
Semi-detached households	1986	1322	658 215	5 990) 1147	565	2249	890 469	871	450	2381	1820 1	.41 1	981 4234	1657	175	29	99	54	71	99 1	8 26	967	4375	469	11376	2249	3684	2545	217	603	19652	5866	25518
Semi-detached households	2005	1824	1818 239	2 1416	5 2290	3389	3124 1	383 534	2588	1699	2513	2324 1	.95 1	979 3178	1758	1867	47	96	156	285	210 9	5 297	1789	3373	534	13265	3124	6998	9364	637	1951	24273	14973	39246
Separate entrance households	1995	12144	1633 928	2 3480	5768	4282	11367 2	979 3989	956	1648	9280	1832 47	66 12	027 24474	9610	1211	159	347	285	270	293 25	6 16	277	29240	3989	58802	11367	3081	12894	978	2280	92101	30530	122631
Shared entrance households	1995	17894 1	10417 2041	7 7561	1 13548	12342	8799 12	731 1546	15991	5352	19106 2	6257 3	82 10	108 13133	10849	2090	3217	5437	5487	5125 6	819 625	9 455	9243	13515	1546	98666	8799	51946	38397	21420	16276	185547	65018	250565
Single-detached households	1986	12779	6742 1129	5 4732	2 7220	7127	6040 3	668 958	9021	3231	13263 1	2601 1	.41 6	175 7345	9168	42	1078	3679	4193	3462 5	062 161	3 701	2916	7486	958	61080	6040	25239	21131	11215	11103	105020	39232	144252
Single-detached households	2005	16759	9696 1544	6 5824	4 12281	11539	10682 9	256 1208	20126	6105	18230 2	6851 2	59 8	135 11265	11645	2463	3667	8840	6618	7441 7	846 758	9 2827	12117	11524	1208	85295	10682	61921	35979	26543	21563	185283	69432	254715
Other dwelling type households	1986	583	75 61	9 72	2 1293	683	794	90 442	422	304	590	796 2	15	490 1041	504	0	117	221	99	124	100 5	4 82	194	1256	442	2948	794	1494	2051	395	624	6093	3911	10004
Other dwelling type households	2005	913	427 76	1 421	1 889	748	1035	622 277	524	313	641	630 1	.70	893 1021	659	279	128	403	234	297	283 22	9 134	101	1191	277	4910	1035	1389	2343	937	950	8427	4605	13032

		Vista	ner shore /	arview	con Hill neau Centre	neau Est	Périphérie	t Club	le Hull	ata / Stittsville	son-Angers ivale	ans	wa Centre	wa East	wa Inner Area	wa West	eau	al East	al Northeast	al Northwest	al Southeast	al Southwest	al West th Gloucester /	rim th Nepean	tral Ottawa	tral Gatineau	an Ottawa	an Gatineau	urban Ottawa	urban Gatineau	al Ontario	al Quebec	ario	bec	
Indicator	Vear	VIta	ay vi	Ş	Sea Sati	bati bati	3	Ē	ē	. gu	ler las	ž	tta	Otta	tta)tta	lat	5	E S	E S	L D	5	10	eit eit	en	ы Б	£	£	q	- P	ŝ	'n	Ĕ	Š	Ľ,
Average trip length (arigin)	1005	4	<u>ч</u> ш.	-	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		 7	10			0	0	<u> </u>	0		15	14	15	10	17	<u> </u>	12 0					S	s	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Average trip length (origin)	1995	0	-	-	0	5 /	0	/	-	10	8 1	0 0		0	5	0	/	15	14	15	10	1/	9	12	2										
Average trip length (origin)	2005	6	/	/	6	6 /	6	/	/	9	12 (6 8	. /	6	5	5	6	14	14	16	14	15	1/	11	5										
Average trip length (destination)	1995	6	6	7	6	5 7	6	7	6	10	9	7 8	6	6	5	6	6	15	14	16	16	16	9	11 9	Э										
Average trip length (destination)	2005	6	7	7	6	6 7	6	7	7	9	12 (6 8	7	6	5	5	6	14	14	16	14	14	17	11	3										
Originating trips	1995	209038	67191 2126	56 764	96 12148	4 82895	125798	91033	55682 104	875 342	12 20179	9 168907	160019 1	24272 25	6432 1	20122	10252	13166	20472	21691	28111	37589 4	1792 3	4613	6 416451	55682	1035416 1	25798	323346	281822 1	120658	76376 1	1895871	539678	2435549
Originating trips	2005	228741	68759 1794	84 837	01 11847	6 83084	138166	108370	46482 202	809 356	33 22724	4 212837	155823 1	29447 28	33461 1	49138	28505	16591	33747	26514	36898	17487 3	1372 15	182 9896	439285	46482	1106126 1	38166	529796	298824 1	132348	95893 2	2207555	579365	2786919
Destination trips	1995	209631	66786 2127	62 764	61 12131	8 82844	125857	90698	55593 104	779 341	70 202008	8 168640	160536 1	24263 25	6767 1	19864	10179	13208	20444	21877	28013	37389 4	1759 3	357 4593	417303	55593	1035687 1	25857	322710	281128 1	120369	76491 1	1896069	539069	2435138
Destination trips	2005	229212	68698 1791	22 836	47 11853	3 82624	138705	107805	46402 202	896 355	73 227660	0 212803	156033 1	29807 28	33880 1	19381	28690	16462	33727	26473	36958	17555 3	1327 15	027 0858	/39912	46402	1106637 1	38705	529521	298545 1	132301	95773	2208372	579/25	2787797
Eemale transit trins (by res)	1096	27/52	6409 252	09 107	25 901	6 6999	0652	0/95	2690 0	000 19	72 2590	1 212005	1970	19006 2	0595	15226	565	959	2222	20170	2255	2150	555	22 15050	22/55	2690	122100	0652	26047	21077	6027	6225	200572	/1/25	2/0072
Female transit trips (by res)	1005	15467	4170 101	52 72	04 401	2 2002	6 5055	0211	1424 4	052 5	73 2303	0 15254	2011	11254 1	00000	0000	010	221	2323	2025	105	201	1240	11 200	10700	1424	01007	5055 C211	22114	12202	2072	1104	100550	21221	147702
Female transit trips (by res)	1995	13407	41/0 101	.55 72	04 421	2 2992	0.170	42000	1454 4	770 44	10 1000	9 15254	2911	11234 1	10795	9000	310	551	225	415	105	591	1240	11 299	19700	1454	000000	0511	25114	12295	2075	2004	120550	21251	147702
Female transit trips (by res)	2005	21142	5704 159	56 84	31 609	2 5011	9478	12900	1/22 9	//0 11	44 14/34	4 24644	1566	14900 1	19241	11634	3109	663	1265	596	/14	410	442	180 751	20806	1/22	99696	9478	42411	19916	2229	3004	165142	34121	199263
Male trips (by res)	1986	106312	41963 1099	52 473	38 5155	3 41257	59001	45422	11720 63	532 136	01 113809	9 95070	10976	63187 10	02703	60540	3135	5913	15674	15206	18451	28927	6951 3	790 2610	2 113679	11720	546560	59001	188494	137908	60242	44481	908975	253110	1162086
Male trips (by res)	1995	90768	47011 1001	.84 405	44 6577	7 63642	60610	59666	13205 69	749 210	80 95734	4 117053	14065	61107 10	04213	55918	10234	12670	18497	19373	20876	27747 2	8992 1	929 4071	2 118278	13205	503921	60610	229444	186664	90284	58950	941928	319429	1261357
Male trips (by res)	2005	91528	46265 936	59 373	78 6073	9 54782	60044	62826	11421 107	126 224	60 93863	3 134426	10720	61488 12	23297	65192	18702	14914	31545	20236	29121	30440 2	6618 10	359 6513	5 134018	11421	505934	60044	317547	180489 1	101092	74241 1	1058591	326195	1384786
Female trips (by res)	1986	102353	36391 1084	28 459	29 4858	0 38438	48003	42820	13091 61	361 127	33 107813	3 89832	10080	64276 11	16323	65642	4665	5676	14327	14719	16236	24828	6281 2	542 2260	126403	13091	537262	48003	176438	128074	53021	41779	893123	230947	1124070
Female trips (by res)	1995	93420	44806 1007	48 381	95 6705	1 57069	58247	58782	11499 67	201 200	20 9593	7 120963	12218	64378 10	09328	64585	11152	12218	17513	18156	19833	27447 2	7277 1	321 3603	5 121546	11499	516045	58247	226022	180078	86775	55688	950387	305512	1255899
Eemale trins (by res)	2005	98780	46263 988	07 411	77 6073	5 54628	59420	68294	9278 108	442 228	73 10077	1 141386	9136	65113 12	21101	72009	20485	13449	26440	20754	27938	30722 2	6403 10	50 6779	130237	9278	544951	59420	328277	182110	98511	70067 1	1101977	320876	1422852
Male transit trins (by res)	1096	10/96	6279 210	06 109	84 545	2 /200	7724	7200	1651 0	196 12	05 2079	1 22727	1705	05/6 1	17977	0021	257	054	2210	2117	2/15	2225	651	05 511	10527	1651	00926	7224	27920	16296	7255	6541	164549	21912	106260
Male transit trips (by res)	1005	11045	2066 110	47 50	04 343	1 2240	4901	6072	1204 4	400 12 600 1		4 22/2/	1700	0070 1	12160	6507	694	200	122	170	76	212	1156	11 205	1 12002	1201	59000	1204	31730	10300	1725	400	06242	15472	111715
Male transit trips (by res)	1995	11045	5000 110	47 50	07 279	1 2049	4001	0075	1204 4	000 1	00 44.00	3 15255	1/55	40000	12100	7622	2602	260	1005	1/9	70	215	1150	11 303	10095	1204	30905	4001	21/20	0009	1/25	499	90242	13475	111/15
Male transit trips (by res)	2005	15881	5328 135	43 64	33 545	9 3945	7064	11391	1339 9	9/5 /	09 1168	9 22098	1495	10886	L//53	7633	2682	812	1005	334	708	680	449	92 /2/4	19248	1339	77456	7064	39940	1/414	2649	2048	139292	27865	16/15/
Auto-drive trips (by res)	1986	113229	46363 1208	47 461	61 5/52	9 47508	60457	48902	8846 /3	642 159	8/ 11/64	8 95357	6184	64379 8	33002	6/0/8	5333	/300	17894	18342	21181 :	33345	8636 4	130 2785	89186	8846	578243	60457	201284	156/33	/0463	52224	9391/6	278259	121/435
Auto-drive trips (by res)	1995	100089	52136 1168	32 424	93 8351	3 75737	68172	68075	10564 88	546 261	70 108533	3 135342	7762	62403 7	7535	64425	14667	17505	25823	25894	28398	38810 3	6426 2	946 5086	85297	10564	562850	68172	277704	226053 1	121139	77887 1	1046990	382677	1429667
Auto-drive trips (by res)	2005	101079	58088 1126	74 454	01 7686	5 70201	71385	73870	9580 138	356 313	60 11277:	1 159459	6333	62307 8	34320	71360	24365	19208	38840	29087	42003 4	13464 3	8755 16	686 8588	90653	9580	579461	71385	400385	229519 1	143430	99287 1	1213929	409771	1623700
Auto-passenger trips (by res)	1986	31286	10267 302	91 154	03 1573	0 12022	17100	15077	3088 18	850 41	64 3818	6 27413	1546	16259 2	23898	20520	1079	2096	3826	5635	5782	10098	2643	964 7024	25444	3088	167021	17100	54252	39099	20619	13624	267336	72911	340247
Auto-passenger trips (by res)	1995	31260	14375 322	64 127	91 2237	3 22482	20285	19844	3557 21	042 63	88 3153	6 38335	2939	19653 2	25651	16676	3418	3847	5741	6702	6276	7863	9157	502 996	28590	3557	164025	20285	69943	62647	27144	18831	289701	105320	395022
Auto-passenger trips (by res)	2005	27066	11779 262	42 103	23 1858	2 15337	14241	18652	2409 32	070 58	15 28798	8 38767	1185	15729 2	23122	17739	5599	4163	8435	5823	6895	8879	7462 2	322 1731	24308	2409	144550	14241	90468	51297	27399	20072	286725	88018	374743
Bicycle trips (by res)	1986	2021	1396 18	90 15	69 114	7 261	814	598	372	430	64 3510	0 780	114	1686	8525	1523	0	0	82	39	217	267	0	0 19	8639	372	12798	814	1405	2804	484	185	23326	4175	27500
Bicycle trips (by res)	1005	1909	1019 15	00 11	51 114	2 1290	11/0	924	609	702 2	27 2750	0 7/27	272	1645	9921	2222	176	51	100	100	215	207	216	10 59	015/	609	12000	11/0	2022	2724	970	621	26955	6112	27060
Bicycle trips (by res)	1995	2477	1016 15	40 11	20 05	2 1509	1075	1125	0000	195 5	2/3	9 2457	323	2171	0031	3223	770	22	207	217	120	290	510	10 56	0204	000	10000	1075	3025	2214	0/9	051	20000	6112	32900
Bicycle trips (by res)	2005	24//	896 16	49 4	20 85	5 688	18/5	1125	850 1	196 4.	30 3234	4 2239	166	31/1	9128	4302	//6	33	207	317	136	222	68	107 67	9294	850	163//	1875	4217	3214	459	954	30347	6893	37239
Motorcyle trips (by res)	1986	0	0	0	0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0 (0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Motorcyle trips (by res)	1995	86	0 2	.09	43 16	0 100	192	42	43	260	77 158	8 149	0	100	421	44	0	0	43	19	35	0	122	0	421	43	680	192	409	260	156	139	1667	634	2301
Motorcyle trips (by res)	2005	34	58	97	0 7	9 125	22	43	0	215	80 164	4 347	0	79	173	173	27	16	100	53	19	37	0	38 14	1 173	0	590	22	741	288	73	232	1577	542	2119
Public transit trips (by res)	1986	44251	10158 435	73 200	04 1245	3 10030	15479	14068	4961 15	402 21	91 4296	6 35743	3574	27345 4	16135	24340	822	1446	2663	2753	2700	4258	651	529 828	49710	4961	216547	15479	59962	33463	9055	7607	335273	61511	396784
Public transit trips (by res)	1995	26459	7236 272	00 123	25 700	3 5341	11066	15131	2718 9	453 74	44 23354	4 28464	4644	19586 2	28913	16427	1601	612	355	589	180	603	2403	21 685	33556	2718	140482	11066	44790	21182	3798	1689	222626	36655	259281
Public transit trips (by res)	2005	37023	11032 294	99 148	64 1155	1 8956	16542	24291	3061 19	746 18	53 26422	2 46742	3060	25786 3	36994	19267	5791	1475	2270	930	1422	1090	890 1	072 1479	40054	3061	177152	16542	82350	37330	4878	5053	304434	61986	366420
School bus trins (by res)	1986	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0 (0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
School bus trips (by res)	1005	1997	4607 21	66 9	91 266	0 5250	1729	2622	179 5	014 22	24 166	6 7264	0	447	524	520	201	1561	2/29	2045	2490	2920	2206	07 214	524	179	11215	1729	15510	14025	11095	6709	29224	221/19	60482
Coheal hustring (by res)	2005	2500	2072 45	71 7	27 220	0 5000		2722	70 7	410 20	17 2000	0 7204	. 0	1002	1400	720	141	2524	7220	2045	4722	5055	4400	14 570	1400	1/0	17201	1230	10000	12224	17211	12045	50334	22140	00402
School bus trips (by res)	2005	2560	3072 45	/1 /	37 329	0 5820	0/5	3/22	/9 /	410 25	1/ 3000	0 0050	0	1992	1408	739	141	2524	7329	3200	4/33	5494	4401	514 570	1408	79	1/381	0/5	20296	12324	1/211	13045	56297	20123	82415
Taxi trips (by res)	1986	/15	1/4 4	79 4	/0 4/	5 169	513	280	198	227	48 112	/ 942	/02	888	4050	789	0	111	0	62	0	32	0	88 3.	4/52	198	4749	513	1289	818	143	110	10933	1640	125/3
Taxi trips (by res)	1995	851	327 4	53 2	13 34	6 244	521	462	463	232	61 1018	8 418	264	944	2400	343	39	19	51	58	17	63	87	0 14	2664	463	4285	521	794	956	186	171	7928	2111	10040
Taxi trips (by res)	2005	928	353 7	17 1	26 30	1 251	. 880	538	184	248 1	05 86	7 736	418	780	3772	891	288	58	25	80	0	81	63	25 13	4191	184	4846	880	1141	1192	202	210	10381	2466	12847
Walk trips (by res)	1986	9212	2901 102	42 54	28 468	2 2903	5858	2454	4936 3	638 12	38 9919	9 5658	8936	10381 4	16764	7515	257	95	501	481	411	954	19	20 99	55699	4936	55152	5858	10314	10743	1480	2220	122644	23757	146401
Walk trips (by res)	1995	18956	9640 169	33 74	40 1118	8 7268	14700	7592	6484 8	468 39	92 1966:	1 19723	10238	18790 6	57412	16917	508	688	690	1352	1239	2589	4124	59 344	77650	6484	106288	14700	31691	28603	8639	6034	224268	55821	280089
Walk trips (by res)	2005	18159	6886 161	72 65	67 948	3 7787	13565	8533	4439 15	272 30	70 1874	4 20110	8625	16395 8	34254	22459	2059	852	479	1371	1511	1771	1088	719 820	92879	4439	107029	13565	44309	26215	5223	4920	249440	49139	298579
"Other" mode trips (by res)	1986	1182	258 5	13 4	07 14	0 413	322	261	66	847 2	92 38	5 968	0	707	450	725	0	32	61	208	99	260	19	0 13	450	66	4179	322	1945	811	410	561	6983	1760	8743
"Other" mode trips (by res)	1995	282	110 3	05 1	79 22	7 155	62	146	43	344	R4 30	8 530	0	275	701	647	78	96	215	67	180	242	154	0 16	701	43	2144	62	1035	570	672	366	4552	1041	5593
"Other" mode trips (by res)	2005	983	365 8	44 1	19 /3	0 245	279	3/17	99 1	052 1	05 57	4 757	68	362	1226	271	1/1	3/	301	130	330	122	23/	24 8	1 1294	99	3500	279	1916	1181	728	536	7/38	2095	9533
Work trips (by res)	1096	41642	10167 105	20 205	13 43 61 3335	1 17204	2/5	20124	5001 27	221 50	AA A7AG	1 40057	6204	302	2074	2/1	2257	2002	6057	6654	6000 ·	122	234	24 0	E0259	E 001	2200	2/5	70902	61061	24045	10255	201422	111766	503600
work trips (by res)	1900	41042	10107 405	203	01 2525	4 1/504	24959	20124	2746 20	201 30	44 4740	1 40957	0504	2/155 5	2974	24740	2237	2992	0007	7457	0000	0705	20/2 1	074 1004	39556	2021	470565	24959	79602	01001	24045	19555	391433	111200	502099
work trips (by res)	1995	29842	10401 352	50 134	97 2579	2 21/30	21109	21453	3740 28	101 78	97 3151.	1 45570	5597	221/4 3	8108	19832	4804	5045	7743	7457	8420	10785	9342	330 1000	43014	3740	1/3505	21109	90500	08/33	33598	23097	341343	110/44	458087
Work trips (by res)	2005	31213	18694 355	51 144	42 2524	1 23244	24284	26020	3999 40	134 95.	32 343/8	8 52308	4662	24657 4	15494	23274	9046	5601	13126	8360	12633	12503 1	1348 4	349 2777	50156	3999	189535	24284	125070	/6225	42085	31018	406846	135526	542372
Intra-district work trips	1986	10542	2450 100	53 30	93 352	0 3537	8681	2979	1904 4	277 24	61 9309	9 4249	3486	3972 1	L3046	4607	0	444	833	1582	521	1522	460	44 41	16532	1904	44555	8681	8987	9507	2948	4875	73022	24967	97989
Intra-district work trips	1995	7730	2776 71	.30 18	92 439	5 3078	6438	3300	926 5	404 31	58 6269	9 6475	2729	3201	8479	3465	20	471	515	1085	1165	1812	928	5 100	11208	926	32986	6438	12892	10270	4377	4757	61463	22390	83854
Intra-district work trips	2005	7634	2490 55	50 21	60 415	2 3202	6906	2845	557 12	423 22	74 7008	8 7745	2028	3350 1	L0431	4806	238	570	990	1252	1780	2150	1230	267 243	12459	557	33352	6906	22873	10081	5731	4517	74415	22060	96476
Total work trip length (by res)	1995	194343	94584 3362	85 1026	07 20627	2 104866	164613	146283	19353 232	962 1102	81 22725	4 223671	24040 1	42362 17	79555 1	30250	41958	0 1	133343 1	38800 1	172416 14	13500	0 5	157 13416	3 203594	19353	1279384 1	64613	596258	447680 3	315916 3	382424 2	2395153 1	1014069	3409222
Total work trip length (by res)	2005	191620 1	85024 3007	15 1034	69 18518	9 215747	143493	197777	20433 477	676 1624	66 22062	4 650899	13874 1	41089 19	98941 1	39246	62291	91465 1	194372 1	56645 2	209538 2:	10837 21	8195 56	392 31229	212815	20433	1294541 1	43493 1	497761	648250 7	730035 5	513482	3735152 1	1325659	5060810
Transit work trips (by res)	1986	11000	2442 109	71 52	36 298	8 1919	3332	3265	1200 3	546 5	55 1238	6 10125	1074	6825 1	1967	6260	360	262	234	162	107	522	19	0 194	13042	1200	55942	3332	15618	7709	910	950	85511	13190	98702
Transit work trips (by res)	1995	5692	2189 62	74 27	92 221	0 1/01	2254	3520	566 2	930 2	20 520	6 9674	1038	/307	6221	3798	410	223	1/12	147	76	271	773	11 201	7250	566	31889	2254	14627	6300	13/13	509	55117	9628	64745
Transit work trips (by res)	2005	0104	2027 71	C2 24	AT 200	7 2204	4125	4020	04C F	400 Z	20 3390	5 90/4 E 12002	740	4307	0066	4047	1744	223	142	220	401	422	252	11 201	0914	940	41515	4125	14027	12021	1545	2071	76646	10072	05740
Transit work trips (by res)	2005	8184	50// /1	.03 34	4/ 399	/ 3204	4135	4929	840 5	498 /	og 6495	5 12903	/48	10351	3000	4947	1/44	354	962	320	401	422	352	005 500	9814	846	41515	4135	23/8/	12021	1530	20/1	70046	19072	95/18
Bicycle work trips (by res)	1986	317	54 4	102 4	28 18	1 44	248	225	U	38	32 532	2 115	38	534	2288	379	0	0	0	0	0	32	U	0	2326	0	2817	248	153	279	32	32	5327	559	5887
Bicycle work trips (by res)	1995	393	102 2	15 3	40 13	2 180	252	217	112	116	58 382	2 310	43	480	1593	586	59	0	55	18	17	25	0	0 6	1636	112	2613	252	495	473	42	131	4786	967	5753
Bicycle work trips (by res)	2005	714	154 3	77 1	36 21	9 163	688	335	227	376	49 680	6 400	22	663	2233	1109	243	21	44	59	0	69	21	38 8	2255	227	4020	688	899	780	111	152	7286	1847	9133
Walk work trips (by res)	1986	1264	260 12	93 5	08 77	8 467	935	680	1306	497 1	83 1412	2 805	2761	1733 1	1285	1642	51	16	207	199	155	113	0	0 26	14046	1306	8533	935	1562	1556	283	588	24425	4385	28810
Walk work trips (by res)	1995	2616	741 20	36 11	18 95	2 637	1454	934	863	803 6	49 2489	9 2245	2625	2149 1	L0487	2296	137	127	210	298	244	375	305	40 63	13112	863	13638	1454	3718	2466	1051	1156	31520	5939	37460
Walk work trips (by res)	2005	2138	658 14	10 7	96 90	3 664	1929	970	682 1	226 3	18 263	1 1672	2086	2255 1	13855	2653	370	142	95	256	335	210	206	53 61	15941	682	12853	1929	3568	2595	893	669	33255	5875	39130

Table D-3: Daily trips by district of origin, destination or residence (as specified)

Table D-4: Daily trips by age, gender and district of residence

		ta Vista Imer	lyshore / darview	acon Hill	atineau Centre	atineau Est	ıll Périphérie	Int Club de Hull	inata / Stittsville	asson-Angers	arivale	leans	tawa Centre	tawa East	tawa Inner Area	tawa West	ateau	ıral East	Iral Northeast	Iral Northwest	Iral Southeast	Iral Southwest	Iral West outh Gloucester /	itrim buth Nepean	intral Ottawa	intral Gatineau	ban Ottawa	ban Gatineau	burban Ottawa	burban Gatineau	ıral Ontario	ıral Quebec	ıtario	lébec	ĸ
Indicator Year		à â	မီပီ	å	ő	ö	Ŧ	Ĵe Î	Хa	Ř	ž	ō	ð	ð	ð	ð	ä	2	R	Ř	R	R	S R	s re	రి	రి	5	5	Su	Su	Ru	Ru	ō	đ	ž
Female transit trips (by res) age 11-14 1986	10	93 479	924	747	331	78	878	755 124	379	16	443	1508	0	1119	862	755	0	0	83	170	20	16	0	0 355	862	124	5838	878	2242	888	35	269	8978	2159	11138
Female transit trips (by res) age 11-14 1995	/	32 208	1212	448	221	/4	360	/12 0	402	23	484	//6	113	708	321	312	11/	6	0	55	0	0	142	0 1/8	434	0	4607	360	1356	620	148	/8	6545	1058	/603
Female transit trips (by res) age 11-14 2005	12	48 659	1161	440	159	97	1010 1	832 0	350	124	5/9	15//	0	520	390	4/8	484	44	155	40	82	22	10	9 89	390	270	5259	11/2	2031	1399	126	/9	7807	2651	10458
Female transit trips (by res) age 15-19 1980	24	1 1102	2224	1256	1500	1159	1019 1	525 579 752 100	672	154	3239	2342	290	1//9	1/121	11/2	156	22	133	50	12	14	124	11 444	1700	100	12559	1112	2550	2/09	191	125	17009	2765	29404
Female transit trips (by res) age 15-19 2005	29	97 1102	2334	1729	797	703	1537 3	928 81	2228	102	2600	7017	280	2572	1/127	1519	469	182	262	191	127	62	28	78 1603	1724	81	19739	1537	10926	3161	400	555	37789	5334	37623
Female transit trips (by res) age 20-24 1986	45	96 1149	2916	1578	1021	333	1428 1	405 370	458	200	3648	876	0	3401	3431	1678	308	127	20	145	20	144	19	0 554	3431	370	19221	1428	1888	2811	310	365	24850	4973	29823
Female transit trips (by res) age 20-24 1995	23	334	2119	1005	608	217	886 1	203 264	430	77	2108	2438	474	1380	3655	966	117	0	78	9	0	27	92	0 133	4129	264	11178	886	3002	1277	120	165	18428	2591	21019
Female transit trips (by res) age 20-24 2005	42	78 574	2267	2071	654	596	1648 2	113 383	1719	170	3614	3650	68	1953	4134	1153	103	106	76	13	129	46	80	54 1282	4201	383	17450	1648	6706	1928	361	260	28717	4218	32936
Female transit trips (by res) age 25-54 1986	104	45 1655	10415	4132	2724	1947	3308 3	583 1718	2607	470	9586	7197	1444	7930 1	.3530	5977	257	174	221	60	118	523	0	40 1553	14974	1718	52067	3308	11398	6583	815	751	79254	12361	91614
Female transit trips (by res) age 25-54 1995	72	94 2311	8052	3886	2337	2095	2909 3	863 718	2874	391	6453	8350	1630	5679	8946	5461	430	287	121	260	76	322	889	0 2132	10576	718	40688	2909	13355	7172	1573	773	66192	11573	77765
Female transit trips (by res) age 25-54 2005	86	2722	7672	3204	3482	3069	3963 5	425 870	4688	725	5795	11091	647	7785 1	.0483	5548	1651	330	802	319	360	249	239	269 4062	11129	870	44030	3963	20110	10924	1178	1846	76446	17604	94050
Female transit trips (by res) age 55-64 1986	22	J5 356	1801	932	2/8	216	845	537 584	202	34	2551	2/5	158	1861	3044	2094	0	0	42	12	0	33	0	0 0	3202	584	11981	845	330	850	33	/6	15546	2356	1/902
Female transit trips (by res) age 55-64 2005	15	24 125	7994	669	658	309	523	427 04	295	75	960	1107	200	959	1/20	706	287	0	125	33	16	53	96	70 297	1711	257	6070	523	220	1678	165	25	10163	2691	12854
Female transit trips (by res) age 65+ 1986	33	35 425 86 0	2631	426	142	209	311	93 135	120	98	3197	288	191	1813	5649	3256	207	0	0	0	0	48	0	0 0	5840	135	14804	311	408	352	48	98	21099	896	21995
Female transit trips (by res) age 65+ 1995	16	57 92	1442	512	188	47	662	253 279	180	0	1133	714	226	1642	1817	1636	20	6	0	18	6	0	0	0 22	2043	279	8284	662	917	346	12	18	11256	1305	12561
Female transit trips (by res) age 65+ 2005	15	36 133	1062	319	341	237	635	180 131	36	32	1213	201	273	1110	1378	2229	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 184	1651	131	7648	635	421	824	0	32	9720	1623	11343
Female trips (by res) age 11-14 1986	24	56 2301	4781	2316	2137	2766	2518 1	604 689	3567	944	3486	7331	0	2324	2332	1273	0	461	812	1205	1792	861	134	144 1548	2332	689	18250	2518	12591	7204	3248	2960	36421	13372	49792
Female trips (by res) age 11-14 1995	43	57 3785	4871	2141	4570	3687	2011 3	620 220	4958	1556	4144	8395	269	2782	2122	2724	352	612	1104	1006	1653	1744	1900	40 2191	2391	220	24649	2011	15584	12394	5908	3666	48531	18291	66822
Female trips (by res) age 11-14 2005	56	84 3497	6874	1930	3496	4104	2750 5	133 415	9267	1374	4547	9840	0	2642	3593	4143	832	889	3401	1681	1966	2125	2200	370 4256	3593	415	30953	2750	23733	11929	7180	6456	65459	21550	87008
Female trips (by res) age 15-19 1986	75	16 2255	7002	5040	4621	3914	4508 2	848 835	5823	709	7443	8352	509	3425	4290	1530	0	302	1069	888	648	1268	479	40 1896	4800	835	34803	4508	16111	10790	2696	2666	58410	18799	77209
Female trips (by res) age 15-19 1995	/0	o∠ 4307	5988	3/13	5434	2013	4039 4	816 579	4/56	1059	6/29 9734	17524	882	3364	5460	3354	566 1199	1717	1059	1380	1822	25/1	70//	2030	5900	5/9	36026	4639	18559	140927	11794	3498 6429	06510	24642	92202
Female trips (by res) age 15-19 2005	101	07 4102 19 2229	10099	3529	5675	2400	3255 / 9017 /	103 491	2020	1/15	8/34	1/534	114	4244	5400	5001	669	207	609	2081	967	17/0	269	1/15	16629	491	43/22	3255 9017	34673	12080	2291	2021	90519	24250	120775
Female trips (by res) age 20-24 1980	73	16 200	7773	2882	5673	3907	5925 4	435 1443	3899	1978	8499	8939	2249	5301 1	7449	3611	703	535	1538	835	872	1145	876	129 670	19698	1485	39846	5925	13638	12005	3429	4351	76611	24011	100736
Female trips (by res) age 20-24 2005	82	95 2323	7457	3600	4587	3516	5643 5	242 948	6140	1459	11033	9266	1035	4915 1	7164	3014	635	927	1583	1031	1639	1248	1300	283 4122	18199	948	43557	5643	19811	11062	5115	4073	86682	21726	108407
Female trips (by res) age 25-54 1986	496	16 23388	56301	27071	28612	23142 2	26139 25	881 6558	37044	7304	52676	56288	7576	32405 6	7888	32582	3072	3754	9761	8739	9446 1	4095	4194 1	374 14554	75464	6558	276533	26139	109260	78214	31489	25805	492746	136716	629461
Female trips (by res) age 25-54 1995	515	30 27619	57846	22501	42230	38800 3	34905 38	460 6245	46725	12623	53505	79891	6831	40040 6	57416	36738	8320	8287	12292	12546 1	2768 1	7511 1	19215 1	007 27340	74247	6245	300620	34905	154964	116969	57782	37462	587612	195581	783193
Female trips (by res) age 25-54 2005	497	09 28723	51411	21026	36716	34719 3	84499 41	850 5318	65719	14029	50345	84981	4683	36394 6	8021	39467	14683	8311	15565	11715 1	5979 1	7351 1	15791 7	819 45735	72703	5318	290203	34499	204253	114841	57432	41309	624591	195966	820557
Female trips (by res) age 55-64 1986	170	98 2276	12028	3666	2484	1435	3946 2	212 1349	2702	712	15004	2901	1148	5709	8155	9773	925	64	725	1560	1342	2267	402	516 1166	9304	1349	65491	3946	7284	7120	4075	2996	86153	15412	101565
Female trips (by res) age 55-64 1995	86	29 3239	10978	3985	4444	2482	4865 3	288 1261	2976	1145	10979	6262	807	4795	7211	5892	840	815	1030	1347	1123	2308	1580	310 2283	8019	1261	48546	4865	11831	11005	5826	3523	74221	20654	94876
Female trips (by res) age 55-64 2005	104	26 4691	11993	1962	6889	4402	1527 1	286 1314	10384	2298	11294	13239	722	7045 1	2952	8/68	1911	240	160	2317	2888	3959	2031 1	60 4127	14453	1314	60588	1527	28850	1/893	2101	027	76009	32816	14/20/
Female trips (by res) age 65+ 1995	133	030 71 2124	10697	2518	2913	1539	5308 3	188 1698	2687	1200	11162	3767	1179	7472	9241	11602	234	745	298	786	1187	1851	1601	111 895	10419	1698	56040 60010	5308	7460	6810	5384	2784	83273	4600	99374
Female trips (by res) age 65+ 2005	158	2927	13354	5312	4604	3539	6551 3	621 792	6973	1998	14818	6526	1037	9874 1	3911	13051	1235	583	987	1929	2204	2270	1444	570 2788	14948	792	75929	6551	16957	12304	6501	4915	114335	24562	138897
Male transit trips (by res) age 11-14 1986	15	48 0	1520	795	43	88	419	629 0	0	0	1198	1055	0	1001	518	428	124	32	0	0	0	138	320	421 33	518	0	7119	419	1509	255	490	0	9636	674	10309
Male transit trips (by res) age 11-14 1995	6	94 181	427	609	70	94	699	751 45	332	0	752	745	75	482	467	237	39	0	6	51	0	0	61	0 321	542	45	3951	699	1399	384	61	57	5953	1185	7138
Male transit trips (by res) age 11-14 2005	4	04 680	439	456	145	444	964	393 36	645	0	578	1804	0	748	546	176	418	0	43	41	0	0	0	14 347	546	36	3193	964	2810	1688	0	84	6548	2772	9320
Male transit trips (by res) age 15-19 1986	24	17 150	3317	1684	334	61	526 1	356 0	0	0	2386	2195	0	759	1360	748	0	32	17	681	0	929	1651	309 115	1360	0	12666	526	3119	546	2611	698	19757	1770	21527
Male transit trips (by res) age 15-19 1995	15	40 858	3087	1318	515	502	1161 1	676 258	1018	45	1638	1685	161	1572	1416	752	59	83	12	52	0	0	286	0 1057	1577	258	11583	1161	3760	1933	368	110	17289	3462	20751
Male transit trips (by res) age 15-19 2005	39	15 1514 16 0	3060	1428	785	429	216 4	486 81	24/8	62	3291	6077	415	2163	2104	922	556	199	341	106	300	221	92	55 1190 228 0	1950	81 102	19335	216	9800 1522	3284	1276	509 808	31807	5190	36997
Male transit trips (by res) age 20-24 1986 Male transit trips (by res) age 20-24 1995	16	+0 0	1540	495	324	404	673	747 393	477	0	1652	1404	522	881	2104	739	59	25	0	906	0	16	168	0 408	2938	303	7736	673	2289	1075	210	806 9	13172	2151	15323
Male transit trips (by res) age 20-24 2005	30	71 769	2175	1154	607	648	883 2	296 277	1720	31	2527	3444	190	1525	3440	1192	133	215	0	13	116	42	20	83 1533	3630	277	13940	883	6780	2157	392	45	24743	3362	28105
Male transit trips (by res) age 25-54 1986	71	01 41	8630	3475	1169	268	1877 2	458 51	792	0	7485	10761	940	3342	9734	2808	0	214	196	2272	155	3564	1617 1	523 277	10674	51	35298	1877	13353	1479	5550	2469	64875	5876	70752
Male transit trips (by res) age 25-54 1995	60	91 1615	4976	2358	1790	1281	1802 3	394 373	2401	123	5098	8499	899	4504	6842	3873	527	147	115	62	70	183	597	11 1775	7741	373	30294	1802	12685	5213	996	300	51716	7688	59404
Male transit trips (by res) age 25-54 2005	67	86 2101	6326	2786	3238	2248	3282 3	612 833	4382	522	4398	9144	865	4766	9796	3935	1474	373	598	149	212	429	251	440 3719	10661	833	32610	3282	17685	9062	1266	1270	62222	14447	76669
Male transit trips (by res) age 55-64 1986	25	97 83	1813	1293	215	0	191	151 103	255	0	3000	878	228	877	964	1188	0	32	0	0	0	441	424	293 33	1192	103	10918	191	1459	298	897	0	14465	592	15058
Iviale transit trips (by res) age 55-64 1995	2	59 123	621	220	93	68	168	12/ 64	186	19	381	/05	75	229	498	537	100	25	0	0	0	14	45	0 250	573	64	2374	168	1140	284	84	19	4171	535	4706
Male transit trips (by res) age 65-64 2005	17	72 210 RA 0	8/9	209	344 0	80	3/1	337 112	559	0	2226	2/10	1/	817	847 1/82	1725	100	24	23	24	40	45	80 400	0 324	865	112	513Z	3/1	22/6	20	201	4/	84/4 11247	1300	9/74
Male transit trips (by res) age 65+ 1980	7	54 0 78 0	396	43	0	0	252	178 151	187	0	445	172	122	685	479	369	0	0	0	142	6	0	400	0 44	479	151	2895	252	403	0	541	142	3782	404	4186
Male transit trips (by res) age 65+ 2005	7	53 53	664	101	339	60	248	68 0	192	94	288	236	367	673	1230	689	0	0	0	0	34	33	0	0 161	1597	0	3246	248	589	452	67	94	5498	794	6292
Male trips (by res) age 11-14 1986	37	57 3250	5639	2700	2164	3450	1232 1	710 1035	3967	792	4120	4630	0	1783	2137	1842	103	365	856	955	842	1762	153	80 1825	2137	1035	21553	1232	10502	8967	3123	2603	37315	13836	51150
Male trips (by res) age 11-14 1995	53	38 4896	3872	2389	3773	4490	3008 4	257 1012	5817	1692	5524	9391	75	2484	3042	2412	195	860	969	1243	1699	1690	2343	30 3135	3117	1012	26276	3008	18373	13354	6593	3904	54359	21278	75637
Male trips (by res) age 11-14 2005	45	21 3530	5303	1914	3645	5659	2878 4	345 157	9677	1489	5597	11833	0	3332	4310	3501	1078	1305	2959	1566	2339	2288	1790	319 4796	4310	157	28512	2878	26625	13913	7722	6014	67169	22962	90131
Male trips (by res) age 15-19 1986	58	78 2303	8239	5388	2746	2269	5311 2	306 558	3991	730	6396	6734	114	3860	3881	2180	0	604	663	1436	1398	2504	574	416 1963	3995	558	34246	5311	13104	7317	5080	2829	56425	16014	72439
Male trips (by res) age 15-19 1995	51	55 5382	//26	4075	4892	6375	4475 5	4/1 624	5958	1818	5621	11015	431	3931	5430	23/9	469	841	1099	1313	2098	3063	3621	220 3583	5860	624	34361	4475	20776	1/11/	9621	4230	70619	26446	97065
Male trips (by res) age 20-24	89	20 4905 16 2729	92/8	4079 4593	27/5	4082 2992	7391 2	554 293 419 10/17	22014	1937	84/5 11390	1/32/	1365	4030	0404 1137	5304 6425	103	2358	4587	1803	1358	4299	191	56 1260	12/197	293	49265	3828 7391	9623	10360	3108	8320 1891	75769	29051	96452
Male trips (by res) age 20-24 1986	69	27 2646	7361	2687	5098	4295	7414 3	930 2157	3619	1617	9339	7200	2179	4027 1	6498	3851	898	771	1312	1007	1017	1741	1489	35 1836	18677	2157	38123	7414	12690	12938	5018	3936	74508	26444	100952
Male trips (by res) age 20-24 2005	85	3496	7407	3439	3790	4074	5408 5	527 1019	5187	1587	11064	8939	1132	4543 1	4799	3890	1226	781	1126	840	1863	1908	1409	348 5113	15931	1019	44376	5408	20088	12586	5961	3553	86356	22566	108921
Male trips (by res) age 25-54 1986	511	27 25555	56512	24993	32072	24232 3	32402 29	271 7080	41053	8025	56832	62549	7247	32485 6	3956	25429	2004	3770	9201	8762 1	0526 1	6014	3983 2	169 16067	71203	7080	276648	32402	122138	83864	34293	25988	504283	149333	653616
Male trips (by res) age 25-54 1995	504	58 28102	58771	22753	43099	41201 3	36221 38	487 7878	45989	13280	53438	73893	9275	37670 6	6949	34534	7324	8147	12710	12873 1	3046 1	6361 1	17415 1	136 27476	76223	7878	296112	36221	148494	119726	54969	38862	575798	202688	778486
Male trips (by res) age 25-54 2005	466	53 25617	48234	17677	34639	31200 3	35139 34	187 7966	60934	13038	44615	74160	6432	33230 7	2541	35423	13387	8456	18545	11669 1	6296 1	5253 1	15132 7	40266	78972	7966	260018	35139	182382	104843	55137	43252	576509	191200	767709
Male trips (by res) age 55-64 1986	177	91 2809	15204	6038	5108	4534	4706 3	355 794	3956	1553	16627	4605	1364	6861	9280	11294	514	571	556	1425	1125	2705	632	420 1663	10644	794	77168	4706	10644	12965	5032	3534	103488	21999	125487
Male trips (by res) age 55-64 1995	85	73 2779	11096	4945	5460	3109	4235 2	945 835	3968	1187	9462	8735	1572	5146	5788	5448	664	1191	1555	1690	1310	2129	1764	359 2125	7360	835	47614	4235	15187	12011	6394	4432	76555	21513	98068
Iviale trips (by res) age 55-64 2005	150	26 5220	10533	4558	1272	5/55	0841 5	b8b 1064	10988	2/35	10/37	14/21	1647	7049 1	3231	/916	1235	1299	2832	3211	2867	41/5	526	4920	14878	1064	55907 62194	6841 2502	31916	19919	11966	8/78	114666	36602	151268
Male trips (by res) age 65+ 1986	120	56 2416	10062	2997	2027	2571	4423 2	500 472 845 698	23/0	938	10696	3874	533	6965	6342	6563	332	204 580	430 512	421 904	1462	2215	1516	415 140 1701	6875	698	53080	4423	8643	7346	5033	2353	74370	14820	89190
Male trips (by res) age 65+ 2005	134	52 3497	12905	5711	5181	3413	5950 4	546 922	8226	1675	13375	7446	1398	8699 1	1953	9158	533	715	1496	1147	2053	2516	1530	335 3120	13351	922	67857	5950	19626	12624	6815	4318	107648	23815	131463
	-	_																																	

Appendix E Tables of Extrapolations

Table E-1:	Suburban	shift	exti	rapolatio	ns

	S	urveyed value	S	S	urveyed grow	rth	Forecast from	95-05 growth	Forecast from	86-05 growth
Indicator	1986	1995	2005	1986-1995	1995-2005	1986-2005	2021	2031	2021	2031
Suburban/rural resident proportion	37.1%	45.7%	49.7%	9%	4%	13%	56%	60%	60%	67%
Central/urban resident proportion	62.9%	54.3%	50.3%	-9%	-4%	-13%	44%	40%	40%	33%
Suburban/rural resident proportion (ON)	25.4%	34.1%	39.9%	9%	6%	14%	49%	55%	52%	60%
Central/urban resident proportion (ON)	74.6%	65.9%	60.1%	-9%	-6%	-14%	51%	45%	48%	40%
Suburban/rural resident proportion (QC)	72.7%	78.0%	79.6%	5%	2%	7%	82%	84%	85%	89%
Central/urban resident proportion (QC)	27.3%	22.0%	20.4%	-5%	-2%	-7%	18%	16%	15%	11%
Suburban/rural job proportion		21.0%	24.3%		3%		29%	33%		
Central/urban job proportion		79.0%	75.7%		-3%		71%	67%		
Suburban/rural job proportion (ON)	8.3%	13.6%	18.1%	5%	5%	10%	25%	30%	26%	32%
Central/urban job proportion (ON)	91.7%	86.4%	81.9%	-5%	-5%	-10%	75%	70%	74%	68%
Suburban/rural job proportion (QC)		56.2%	55.1%		-1%		53%	52%		
Central/urban job proportion (QC)		43.8%	44.9%		1%		47%	48%		
To suburban/rural percentage (AM) ON	9.9%	15.6%	22.6%	6%	7%	13%	34%	41%	33%	40%
To suburban/rural percentage (AM) QC	39.6%	49.4%	51.5%	10%	2%	12%	55%	57%	61%	68%
From suburban/rural percentage (AM) ON	25.4%	33.3%	40.2%	8%	7%	15%	51%	58%	53%	61%
From suburban/rural percentage (AM) QC	69.8%	76.4%	78.4%	7%	2%	9%	82%	84%	86%	90%
To CBD percentage (AM)	23.9%	17.9%	15.7%	-6%	-2%	-8%	12%	10%	9%	5%
Average vehicles per household (ON)	1.32	1.25	1.38	-7%	13%	6%	1.59	1.72	1.43	1.46
Average vehicles per household (QC)	1.38	1.33	1.49	-5%	16%	11%	1.75	1.91	1.58	1.64
Zero car household proportion (ON)	15.0%	17.0%	13.0%	2%	-4%	-2%	7%	3%	11%	10%
Zero car household proportion (QC)	11.0%	12.0%	9.0%	1%	-3%	-2%	4%	1%	7%	6%
Detached-house proportion (ON)	45.5%		53.3%			8%			60%	64%
Detached-house proportion (QC)	55.6%		59.1%			4%			62%	64%

Table E-2: (Gender	balance e	extrapolati	ons

	Surveyed values			Surveyed growth			Forecast from	95-05 growth	Forecast from 86-05 growth	
Indicator	1986	1995	2005	1986-1995	1995-2005	1986-2005	2021	2031	2021	2031
Female workforce percentage	40.7%	43.5%	44.8%	3%	1%	4%	47%	48%	48%	50%
Female workforce percentage (ON)	40.8%	43.2%	44.5%	2%	1%	4%	46%	48%	48%	49%
Female workforce percentage (QC)	40.3%	44.3%	45.9%	4%	2%	6%	48%	50%	50%	50%
Female transit use percentage (25-54)	14.7%	10.0%	11.4%	-5%	1%	-3%	14%	15%	9%	7%
Male transit use percentage (25-54)	11.0%	7.6%	9.9%	-3%	2%	-1%	14%	16%	9%	9%
Female transit use percentage (55-64)	17.9%	7.4%	8.8%	-10%	1%	-9%	11%	12%	1%	0%
Male transit use percentage (55-64)	12.2%	4.9%	6.4%	-7%	2%	-6%	9%	10%	2%	0%
Female transit use percentage (65+)	27.3%	12.7%	8.1%	-15%	-5%	-19%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Male transit use percentage (65+)	13.2%	4.8%	5.1%	-8%	0%	-8%	6%	6%	0%	0%
Female auto drive percentage (25-54)	59.1%	60.1%	65.3%	1%	5%	6%	74%	79%	70%	74%
Male auto drive percentage (25-54)	73.6%	76.5%	73.2%	3%	-3%	0%	68%	65%	73%	73%
Female auto drive percentage (55-64)	44.7%	54.1%	62.4%	9%	8%	18%	76%	84%	77%	87%
Male auto drive percentage (55-64)	73.2%	79.4%	77.9%	6%	-2%	5%	75%	74%	82%	84%
Female auto drive percentage (65+)	29.5%	38.8%	54.0%	9%	15%	24%	78%	93%	75%	87%
Male auto drive percentage (65+)	74.1%	77.6%	76.4%	3%	-1%	2%	75%	73%	78%	80%
Female daily trip rate (ages 10+)	3.05	3.00	2.69	-5%	-31%	-36%	2.20	1.89	2.39	2.20
Male daily trip rate (ages 10+)	3.38	3.19	2.81	-19%	-38%	-57%	2.20	1.82	2.33	2.03

	Surveyed values			Surveyed growth			Forecast from	95-05 growth	Forecast from 86-05 growth	
Indicator	1986	1995	2005	1986-1995	1995-2005	1986-2005	2021	2031	2021	2031
Daily work trips/capita 10+	0.75	0.57	0.54	-18%	-3%	-21%	0.49	0.46	0.36	0.25
Daily work trips/capita 10+ (ON)	0.77	0.57	0.54	-20%	-3%	-23%	0.48	0.45	0.34	0.22
Daily work trips/capita 10+ (QC)	0.69	0.56	0.54	-12%	-2%	-14%	0.51	0.49	0.42	0.35
Daily non-work trips/capita 10+	2.44	2.49	2.25	5%	-24%	-19%	1.87	1.64	2.10	2.00
Daily non-work trips/capita 10+ (ON)	2.56	2.55	2.32	-1%	-23%	-24%	1.95	1.72	2.11	1.99
Daily non-work trips/capita 10+ (QC)	2.05	2.32	2.05	27%	-26%	0%	1.63	1.37	2.06	2.06
Daily trip rate ages 11-24 (ON)	3.13	3.04	2.82	-9%	-23%	-32%	2.46	2.23	2.55	2.38
Daily trip rate ages 25-64 (ON)	3.55	3.33	2.99	-22%	-34%	-56%	2.45	2.11	2.51	2.22
Daily trip rate ages 65+ (ON)	2.52	2.16	2.28	-36%	12%	-24%	2.48	2.60	2.08	1.96
Daily trip rate ages 11-24 (QC)	2.69	3.02	2.67	33%	-35%	-2%	2.11	1.76	2.65	2.64
Daily trip rate ages 25-64 (QC)	2.92	3.10	2.71	18%	-39%	-21%	2.09	1.70	2.53	2.42
Daily trip rate ages 65+ (QC)	1.12	0.82	1.77	-30%	95%	65%	3.30	4.25	2.32	2.67

Table E-4: Transit share extrapolations

	Surveyed values			Surveyed growth			Forecast from 95-05 growth		Forecast from 86-05 growth	
Indicator	1986	1995	2005	1986-1995	1995-2005	1986-2005	2021	2031	2021	2031
AM peak non-motorized % to Ottawa CBD		11.8%	13.7%		2%		17%	19%		
AM peak non-motorized % to Gatineau CBD		6.0%	7.5%		2%		10%	12%		
Rural work transit mode share	4.3%	3.3%	6.8%	-1%	4%	2%	12%	16%	9%	10%
Ctrl/Urban Ottawa work transit share	24.0%	18.0%	24.1%	-6%	6%	0%	34%	40%	24%	24%
Ctrl/Urban Gatineau work transit share	14.7%	11.3%	21.3%	-3%	10%	7%	37%	47%	27%	30%
Suburban Ottawa work transit share	19.6%	16.2%	21.5%	-3%	5%	2%	30%	35%	23%	24%
Suburban Gatineau work transit share	12.6%	9.2%	19.0%	-3%	10%	6%	35%	44%	24%	28%