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# DEFINING THE I-81 CORRIDOR BOUNDARY BASED ON ITS INFLUENCE TO ATTRACT HIGHWAY TRIPS 

by<br>Michael B. Sawyer<br>Dr. R. Sivanandan, Chairman<br>Civil Engineering

Corridor coalitions have provided the necessary framework for the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems on a corridor-wide basis. The new federal transportation bill of 1997 is projected to support this type of planning application well into the next century, and there will be a growing need to define corridor boundaries as more coalitions are formed. A methodology to set these corridor boundaries quickly and without elaborate data collection is necessary as planners begin to analyze a particular corridor's needs.

The proposed methodology presented within this report uses shortest path criteria and macroscopic traveler modal choice to fulfill these requirements and defines the potential market of users for I-81. Since origin-destination data is not readily available, the geographic location of cities in relation to a particular interstate highway becomes important as one defines the interstate's influence upon a particular city to attract trips. In this study, the criteria for a major origin or destination to be included in the corridor are based upon three parameters:

- City size must be over 50,000 in population
- The Origin - Destination (O-D) pair must use I-81
- O-D pair must be within the shortest path distance of 368 miles

By using the proposed methodology to define the corridor boundary, 85\% of the automobile travel and approximately $78 \%$ of the truck travel have an origin or destination within the corridor boundary. Future research and validation of this boundary definition needs to be performed before this definition can be fully accepted.
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### 1.0 Background

### 1.1 A Multi-University, Multimodal Research Initiative

The Virginia Tech Center for Transportation Research, in cooperation with the Mid-Atlantic Universities Transportation Center (MAUTC), is developing a program of research, education, and technology transfer within the Interstate 81 corridor. This effort will involve the MAUTC universities as well as federal, state, and local public agencies, and private firms with an interest in the corridor. It is believed that a multimodal, multi-disciplinary program of activities focused on the transportation issues important to this corridor will benefit the region and the states involved.

The I-81 Corridor Council was established in 1989 by Virginia's Planning District Commissions 1 through 7. The primary goals of the Council is to promote both economic growth and to enhance the quality of life along I81. In 1990, the Council released the document "A Proposal for Strategically Developing the Interstate-81 Corridor Region" which addressed the need for establishing strategic alliances and partnerships with neighboring jurisdictions, government agencies, the private sector, and higher educational institutions within the region. It was in this strategic plan that twelve specific recommendations were identified for these new partnerships to complete. One recommendation expressed the need to define the corridor such that the following five items could be identified within the corridor:

- Economic, social, and political conditions
- I-81 trends
- Common interests and goals
- Additional research requirements
- Additional strategic and comprehensive planning needs

In order to fulfill the definition recommendation, the boundary of the I-81 corridor must be defined. One of the first steps in any transportation planning application is to define the boundary and scope of a proposed study. Limiting the study's focus to the area affected by the proposed study is important as it saves time and resources. Various methods have been used to define corridor boundaries; however, no real methodology has been developed as of yet to comprehensively and effectively complete this important first step. This paper attempts to define the corridor boundary over the entire length of Interstate 81 using macroscopic traveler modal choice and shortest path criteria. As a result, this boundary definition for I-81 will allow the potential marketing area of the interstate to be established as the potential users of the interstate are identified.

### 1.2 The Location of I-81

Interstate 81 connects the six states of Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York (See Figure 1.1). Its total length between Knoxville, TN and Watertown, NY is nearly 850 miles. Geographically, it is a main connection between the southern economic hubs of Atlanta, New Orleans, Houston, and Dallas, to the northeastern United States (Center for Transportation Research (CTR), 1996). In addition, it has been defined by the I-95 Corridor Coalition as the outer boundary of the I-95 corridor (I-95 Corridor Coalition, 1995).


Figure 1.1: Location and alignment of Interstate 81

### 1.3 The Organization of this Report

There are four more sections in this report. Section 2.0 identifies through a literature review the various methods of defining corridor boundaries and makes specific reference to the I-81 corridor definition as it fits in with other genres of boundary definitions. In addition, other case studies which involve corridor definition will be reviewed. Section 3.0 presents the proposed methodology for defining the corridor boundary on I-81 for automobile travel using macroscopic traveler modal choice, and discusses the considerations of matching this boundary with truck travel patterns. Section 4.0 defines the corridor boundary for I-81 and verifies this boundary for truck travel within the corridor using weigh station origin-destination data. Section 4.0 also determines which
origin-destination pairs outside of the corridor are expected to use I-81 based on a national study completed by Argonne National Laboratory. Finally, Section 5.0 discusses the results presented in Section 4.0 and suggests areas for future research.

### 2.0 Literature Review

### 2.1 Introduction

Several sources were used in this literature review. The Virginia Tech Library System (VTLS) and the Transportation Research Information System (TRIS) were two databases that were heavily utilized to find many of the resources presented in the following sections. It must be noted that not much attention has been given to corridor definition in the past fifty years, and as a result not many real methodologies exist to build upon. Section 2.2 identifies the types of boundaries that can exist and various techniques for defining a boundary. Section 2.3 discusses other case studies where corridor boundaries have been defined. Finally, Section 2.4 presents the background information for the proposed methodology and the considerations given for the chosen method.

### 2.2 Boundary Types and Definition Techniques

According to Bogg's Classification of Boundary Types, there are four principal genres of boundaries: physical, geometric, anthropogeographic, and complex boundaries (Jones, 1945). Physical boundaries are set by the natural geographic features found within a region, such as mountains, deserts, lakes, bays, straits, rivers, canals, swamps, territorial waters, and contour lines. Geometric boundaries are defined by fixed shapes such as straight lines, latitudinal and longitudinal lines, arcs of circles, or parallel lines to coasts or rivers. Anthropogeographic boundaries are defined for various human interests such as boundaries separating different tribes, languages, religions, economic classes, cultures or for historical reasons. Finally, a complex boundary is a
combination of physical, geometric, or anthropogeographic (Jones, 1945). The boundary classification for the I-81 corridor definition presented in Section 3.0 will be a complex boundary combining the use of straight line geometrics with the anthropogeographic aspects of traveler modal choice.

There are three other categories by which each boundary can be defined. First, a boundary is either internal or international (where military protection is necessary for international boundaries and is not necessary for internal boundaries). Second, a boundary is either natural or artificial, where artificial boundaries are generally more stable and have less conflict. Natural boundaries form where natural demarcations exist or where populations are small. Finally, a boundary is either scientific or organic, where scientific boundaries have been determined from certain quantifiable measures and can be duplicated (Jones, 1945). The I-81 corridor boundary will be an internal, artificial, scientific boundary.

Seven primary methods of boundary definition exist for policy makers to establish various types of boundaries:

- Complete definition
- Complete definition with power to deviate
- Major turning points
- Courses and distances
- Zone
- Natural features
- Definition in principle

Each method of definition has its own unique applications. For instance, a boundary defined by 'definition in principle' may be used to split water
resources evenly between two different tribes. A 'complete definition with the power to deviate' is a boundary that is explicitly defined, but can be slightly altered to a more feasible solution (Jones, 1945). I-81's corridor boundary will be defined by major turning points and will be described in Section 3.0.

Accessibility is a newer theory which can be utilized to set corridor boundaries. Based on Horton and Strahler's method of Stream Ordering, one can show similarities between transportation networks and drainage systems (Haggett, 1969). According to Peter Haggett, author of several books on geography and transportation systems, the existence or absence of a transportation facility dictates whether or not a resource is available. Haggett recognized that the freeways and interstates of the United States are like the major rivers of the world -- they have tributaries and create their own watersheds or vehicle sheds. Using graph theory and techniques such as nodal and route hierarchies, branching ratios, connectivity coefficients, network shape, and shortest path criteria, one could generate a corridor boundary that would define (in distance) a freeway's influence (Haggett, 1969).

Several quantifiable measures can be used to define the distance a roadway influences. Time distance (isocrones), Euclidean distance, physical features, economic cost functions, perceptual user choice, and traffic flow characteristics are some of the measures that can be used to define where a corridor's boundary should be placed (Lowe, 1975). When considering the I-81 corridor definition, a combination of the shortest
time and perceptual modal choice will define the extent of auto travel on I-81.

### 2.3 Case Studies of Corridor Definitions

Corridor boundary definitions vary as the purpose of the boundary changes. The I-95 corridor runs from Augusta, Maine in the north to Norfolk, Virginia in the south, with the Atlantic Ocean providing a natural boundary in the east and interstates 81,84 , and 91 acting as the western boundary. The I-95 Corridor Coalition has defined its boundaries to be flexible so that no opportunities for partnerships will be missed, and to accommodate all that may travel through the corridor regardless of origin or destination. Therefore, the I-95 Corridor Coalition defines its corridor based on what appears to be natural and anthropogeographic boundaries (I-95 Corridor Coalition, 1995).

There are several other methods used to define study boundaries. For I-81, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has three construction districts (Bristol, Salem, and Staunton) through which I-81 is aligned (VDOT, 1996). In Virginia, I-81 also traverses seven planning districts (Lenowisco, Cumberland Plateau, Mount Rogers, New River Valley, Fifth, Central Shenandoah, and Lord Fairfax) (CTR,1996). These planning districts gather socio-economic data for their region as well as develop strategic plans for their respective areas (CTR, 1996). Either the construction districts or the planning districts could be used as a boundary to describe the surrounding area. In the next twenty years, I81 will have to be widened in certain sections of its alignment, and environmental studies must be completed. For these studies, another
boundary definition would be assigned. The corridor would be set to include a certain distance on either side of I-81's mainline, and this area would be analyzed for potential environmental impacts due to interstate reconstruction projects.

The economic impacts of I-81 on local land use offer yet another boundary definition. The I-81 Corridor Coalition has completed an Interchange Study to provide a detailed analysis of five interchange areas along particular sections of I-81. The choice of the corridors for each of the studies was based on coordination between the various planning district commissions and their respective county planning districts. The actual study corridors varied individually by site and were not defined by any strict criteria (I-81 Corridor Coalition, 1992).

Finally, four ITS Priority corridors have been established throughout the United States by the Federal Highway Administration. They are located in Southern California, Houston, Chicago, and the Northeastern United States. The four corridor boundaries were not set by any strict criteria, and varied by location. For instance, the Southern California boundary was established based on air districts and political boundaries in the area. In another example, the sixteen counties forming the three Metropolitian Planning Organizations of Chicago, Gary, and Milwaukee established the boundary for the Chicago ITS priority corridor. These priority corridors were not established based on the highway trips they attracted and used no real methodology to define their boundaries.

### 2.4 The I-81 Corridor Boundary Definition

### 2.4.1 Considerations

Several options for defining the I-81 corridor boundary were discussed before deciding on the methodology presented in Section 3.0. One of the important criteria in defining a highway corridor boundary is to determine the extent of the area which it influences in terms of attracting trips. This influence can best be determined through the analysis of intercity trip table data by identifying which Origin-Destination (O-D) pairs use I-81. The ideal solution would have been to use data from a large random sample of users obtained over a one year time period, during various times of the day, and along the entire length of I-81. This would account for changes in travel patterns due to the season, time of day, and geography. This type of data, however, does not exist and it would be very expensive to obtain. Since this data does not exist, the geographical location of a city was utilized as a surrogate measure to determine whether or not an O-D pair used I-81. Using the concept of geographical location in relationship to $\mathrm{I}-81$, the next step analyzed the average trip length and how far one was willing to travel in an automobile before considering other modes (such as flight) as an alternative. This average trip length of 350 miles provides part of the criteria used to develop the proposed methodology, and is discussed in detail in Section 2.4.2.
2.4.2 Background for Proposed Methodology: The Air - Auto Modal Choice Line

The automobile is the predominant mode of transportation for all intercity trips. According to the 1994 Annual Report on Transportation

Statistics (Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), 1994), over 80\% of all trips greater than 100 miles are either automobile or truck trips (Figure 2.1). 55\% of business trips use either the automobile or truck as the principal mode of transportation and $85 \%$ of all pleasure trips use this principal mode.


Figure 2.1: Modal Choice by Trip Purpose (1991)
(Source: Transportation Statistics Annual Report, 1994)
Modal choice for intercity travel is based upon two principal parameters: the trip's purpose, and the distance between the origin and destination. Business trips in 1990 averaged 862 miles round-trip for all of the modes. The average distance traveled for personal trips was less, at 799 miles round-trip. If all trips (business and personal) are analyzed by trip length, one notices that the modal choice of the lower trip-length categories gravitate towards the use of the automobile as opposed to air travel; however, as the distance between origin and destination increases, the usage of air travel increases as transportation users see the true benefits of aviation (See Figure 2.2). Air travel does not begin to
dominate intercity travel until the round-trip flight distance is greater than 2,000 miles (BTS, 1994).


Figure 2.2: Air and Auto Trips by Trip Length (1990) (Source: Transportation Statistics Annual Report 1994)
$60 \%$ of all intercity auto trips are less than 500 miles round-trip. The average auto trip length is 577 miles round-trip. Air travel, on the other hand, only has $10 \%$ of its intercity trips under 500 miles with an average round-trip length of 2,200 miles. Approximately $3 \%$ of all auto trips are longer than 2,000 miles round-trip (compared to $40 \%$ of all air trips). Finally, looking at other modes, Amtrak has an average one-way trip of 290 miles, and intercity bus trips are approximately 140 miles in length one way (BTS, 1994).

From this 1991 survey, one notes that $85 \%$ of all intercity trips utilize the automobile to travel a one way distance of less than 350 miles. Therefore, it is plausible to use this trip length as a cutoff point to define the I- 81 corridor boundary. As a result, the distance of 350 miles will be used to determine which cities should be included as a major origin or
destination within a particular study region. Truck travel will be analyzed separately according to how well truck travel patterns match the corridor boundary definition for automobiles.

### 2.5 Summary

From the various resources gathered from the literature review, it becomes apparent that very little research has taken place in the past fifty years on defining corridor boundaries for planning applications. Using the air-auto modal choice line of 350 miles, and the shortest time path from major origins to destinations will provide the necessary criteria to develop the corridor boundary definition for I-81 based upon modal choice. In Section 3.0, the methodology for this approach will be discussed.

### 3.0 Methodology

### 3.1 Introduction

The methodology developed in the following sections will allow the I-81 corridor boundary to be defined using several parameters which will be introduced here and discussed further in sections 3.2 through 3.5. The definition of a major origin or destination will be discussed in Section 3.2. The shortest path criteria used in this study will be discussed in Section 3.3. In addition, the air-auto modal choice line developed in Section 2.4 will briefly be discussed again in Section 3.3. In Section 3.4, both a flow chart depicting the decision process of the proposed methodology and an illustrative example using this process will be presented. Finally, Section 3.5 will discuss the considerations for analyzing truck travel, and why it was important to check the corridor boundary defined by the proposed methodology with how well it represents truck travel on I-81. At the conclusion of Section 3, the final criteria that was used to define the I-81 corridor boundary will be summarized in Section 3.6.

The methodology for defining the I-81 corridor boundary is based upon identifying who the potential users of I-81 are, and where the potential market of users exists. The main purpose of this methodology is to determine the influence of the corridor in attracting all trip types to I-81.

### 3.2 Major Origins and Destinations based on City Size

Population is an important factor in determining which cities are significant enough to be included as an origin or destination within a
particular region. Selection of a cut-off population size for this project was based on three criteria:

- Total number of cities within 350 miles of I-81's alignment
- Importance as an origin or destination
- Compatibility with software

The total number of cities within 350 miles above a specified population was considered because too many cities would be cumbersome and redundant in defining the corridor boundary. In the same vein, too few cities would give a sparse and incomplete picture of the corridor. Secondly, the importance of a city as an origin or destination was also analyzed because the geographic location of a particular city within a given region dictates the impact of a particular interstate highway. As the city's distance away from the interstate decreases, the impact of that interstate on travel through that city should increase. Finally, compatibility with the software, AUTOMAP for Windows Version 1.10.02, (NextBase Ltd., 1992) was also an influence when determining what the cutoff point for city size would be. Taking these three criteria into account, a city population of 50,000 using 1990 census data was determined as the cut off point for city size.

As a result of using a population of 50,000 as the cutoff point, 129 cities were identified within a 350 mile distance from I-81. There were enough cities present to effectively mark the corridor's boundary without being redundant. In addition, a population size of 50,000 is commonly used in planning applications. Finally, the software AUTOMAP could handle 50,000 as an effective cutoff point because that population is within its
design standards and was very helpful in identifying key origins and destinations within the region.

### 3.3 Shortest Path Criteria

Shortest path criteria was used to predict which route users would choose to travel from their origins to specified destinations. In general, the shortest path is determined by the shortest time distance and not the shortest distance. For this study, the shortest time distance was used to satisfy the shortest path criteria. Since the distance of 350 miles (determined in Section 2.4) was a major factor for deciding whether air or auto was used for a particular trip, the quickest time may not be the shortest distance. Therefore, an arbitrary 5\% increase in the distance cutoff point criteria was included to create a more accurate corridor boundary. This is due to the fact that distances between cities of populations over 50,000 are significant (over 100 miles on average) and if a particular city was excluded from the corridor because it was barely over 350 miles, then the corridor boundary could change by over 100 miles. The cutoff point with the $5 \%$ increase is 368 miles. It should be noted that AUTOMAP uses the given speed limits on a particular roadway to determine the shortest time path, and it does not allow for temporal and spatial variations in calculating this path.

### 3.4 Illustration of Methodology

The flow chart in Figure 3.1 depicts the general process which was completed for each O-D pair that was considered in this study. For illustrative purposes, an example using the cities of Roanoke, Virginia, (City A) and Washington, D.C., (City B) will be used. The 1990
population of Roanoke, Virginia, was 100,220 and was 638,333 for Washington, D.C., using AUTOMAP's population information. Roanoke is located on the I-81 alignment and Washington, D.C. is approximately 65 miles away from I-81, so both Roanoke and Washington are less than 350 miles away from I-81 using straight line distances to I-81. The shortest time distance was then calculated by AUTOMAP and a quickest route was drawn as shown in Figure 3.2. Since I-81 was used in the quickest route, and since the total distance was less than 368 miles, both cities would be included within the I-81 corridor.

### 3.5 Considerations for Truck Travel on I-81

Trucks compose a significant portion of the traffic stream. In 1992, the corridor averaged approximately 8,150 trucks per day in Virginia, or $25 \%$ of the total average traffic flow. This truck percentage fluctuates throughout the corridor, generally ranging from $22 \%$ to $30 \%$ daily (VDOT). The weekends register higher truck volumes northbound and the mid-week registers higher volumes southbound. One section in Virginia registered a truck percentage as high as $37 \%$. While the percentage of trucks varies over the length of I-81, the total number of trucks does not change significantly throughout the year (depicted in Figure 3.3). Considering that trucks have passenger car equivalents ranging from 1.5 to 6.0, (Transportation Research Board, 1994) the total traffic volume in terms of passenger cars is even higher.


Figure 3.1: I-81 Corridor Definition Methodology


Figure 3.2: Shortest Time Path: Roanoke, VA to Washington, D.C. (AUTOMAP software used to generate map)


Figure 3.3: 1992 Monthly Truck Volume on I-81 - Montgomery County, VA (Source: VDOT)

Since trucks compose a significant portion of the traffic stream, it was deemed necessary that the corridor boundary created using the aforementioned methodology should be verified by examining truck origins and destinations using I-81. The weigh station in Stephens City, Virginia, is located approximately at the halfway point of I-81's entire length and provides an excellent location to determine and possibly verify the I-81 corridor boundary for truck travel. At the Stephens City weigh station, origin-destination data is collected for every truck that violates certain regulations set forth by the Commonwealth of Virginia. From $5 / 94$ to $4 / 95,10,154$ truckers (or $3 \%$ of the trucks weighed) were given citations and their origins and destinations were documented. In March of 1996, VDOT's maintenance division began to computerize all of their violation records (beginning with January 1995) and are currently keypunching all of the weigh station records for every weigh station in Virginia (VDOT, 1996). The effects of the 'violator-only' origin destination data are not known. Since it is the only accessible information at the time of this report, it is assumed to represent the whole trucking population along I-81. The results of this data are discussed in Section 4.3.

### 3.6 Summary

The I-81 corridor definition used the aforementioned criteria discussed in Section 2.4 and Sections 3.2 through 3.6. The criteria for a major origin or destination to be included in the corridor is based upon three parameters:

- The city has to be over 50,000 in population
- The origin - destination pair must be within the shortest path distance of 368 miles ( $5 \%$ over 350 miles)
- The O-D pair must use I- 81 for a portion of its trip The proposed methodology's goal is to define the potential market of users of I-81. Since trucks comprise 22 to $30 \%$ of the total traffic stream within Virginia's section of I-81, it is also important to verify the corridor boundary defined by the proposed methodology for trucks.


### 4.0 Study Findings

### 4.1 Introduction

In Sections 4.2 through 4.4, the findings of this study will be presented. The corridor boundary definition for automobiles (based on traveler modal choice) will be defined in Section 4.2, and the truck origin destination data presented in Section 4.3 will verify this boundary for trucks based on data gathered from a weigh station located at the midpoint of I-81's entire length. Finally, a national study completed by Argonne National Laboratory will be presented in Section 4.4 to identify the possible shortest time paths of origin-destination pairs beyond the corridor's boundary definition.

### 4.2 I-81 Corridor Boundary

Using the Intelligent Road Atlas software AUTOMAP Version 1.10.02 (NextBase Ltd., 1992), the cities which had a population of over 50,000 and were within 350 miles of I-81 were identified. 129 cities were within 350 miles and were identified by straight line distances or using an 'as the crow flies' distance. AUTOMAP has several features which were advantageous to the completion of this project. The following features were some of the major applications used and, as a result, the time savings when compared to completing the calculations by hand was substantial:

- The shortest time path was determined by AUTOMAP using major roads and specified speed limits
- The population size hierarchy provided within AUTOMAP could easily determine which cities were greater than 50,000 people
- The geographic locator of places gave the location of origins and destinations
- The straight line distance icon gave an accurate measure of which cities were initially included within the corridor definition study
- The print features and zoom capabilities of AUTOMAP allowed for accurate pictures to be included within this report

After identifying all of the cities over 50,000 that were within 350 miles of I-81, the shortest time distance was determined using all the identified cities along I-81 and to the west of I-81 as origins and the other cities to the east as destinations. The origins and destinations were set up in this manner for convenience purposes because only $15 \%$ of the cities were to the west or along I-81 and it was faster to generate an O-D matrix as less repetitions of the same O-D data were made. If a particular origindestination pair used I-81 and the length of the trip was less than 368 miles ( $5 \%$ increase over 350 miles), then it was included within the corridor definition. Figure 4.1 gives a picture of what the I-81 corridor looks like using the aforementioned criteria with major turning points. This boundary includes 97 cities over 50,000 in population, and is expected to represent $85 \%$ of all the automobile trips within this region. This $85 \%$ is based upon the nationwide statistics previously discussed in Section 2.4.2 (BTS,1994). It is assumed that all the trips between cities included within this corridor definition use I-81 for a portion of their trip to travel to at least one city less than 368 miles away.


Figure 4.1: I-81 Corridor Boundary for cities over 50,000 (AUTOMAP software used to generate map)

### 4.3 Truck Weigh Station Origin-Destination Data

For this project, the weigh station data at Stephens City, Virginia, from January 1, 1995, to June 8, 1995, were used to find the percentage of truck origins or destinations that were within the I-81 corridor boundary definition. The effects of the 'violator-only' origin - destination data are not known. Since it is the only accessible information the time of this report, it is assumed to represent the whole trucking population along I81. With this in mind, 2,040 usable origin-destination pairs were analyzed to see if they were within the defined corridor. $78 \%$ of the origins and destinations analyzed were within the defined corridor and
can be seen in Table 4.1. Figure 4.2 presents the percentages of origins and destinations by state for violators at the Stephens City weigh station. Virginia and Pennsylvania comprised $38 \%$ of the total number of origins and destinations. Texas and Canada both had $3 \%$ of the total origins and destinations combined.

In 1995, a separate trucking survey was completed by the Center for Transportation Research to identify trucking issues on I-81. This survey interviewed a total of fifty truckers between two rest areas located on I81. Up to $88 \%$ of surveyed origins and destinations could be within the corridor boundary definition, however only the state (and not the specific city) was identified in this study. and some of the states are split geographically by the corridor boundary definition.

Table 4．1：Violating Truck Origins and Destinations using I－81 （Source：VDOT＇s Stephens City Weigh Station Data for $1 / 1 / 95-6 / 8 / 95$ ）

| State | Within＿－81 Corridor |  | Outside Corridor |  | Not Known |  | Total | Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Origin | Destination | Origin | Destination | Origin | Destination |  |  |
| Tennessee | 56 | 127 | 9 | 43 | 0 | 5 | 240 | 5．55\％ |
| South Carolina | 26 | 56 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 102 | 2．36\％ |
| North Carolina | 97 | 262 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 384 | 8．88\％ |
| Virginia | 306 | 459 | 20 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 810 | 18．72\％ |
| West Virginia | 28 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 1．25\％ |
| Kentucky | 5 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 0．51\％ |
| Ohio | 19 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 0．88\％ |
| Maryland | 50 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 112 | 2．59\％ |
| Pennsylvania | 569 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 838 | 19．37\％ |
| Delaware | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0．18\％ |
| New Jersey | 174 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 242 | 5．59\％ |
| New York | 208 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 7．05\％ |
| Connecticut | 38 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 1．36\％ |
| Rhode Island | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0．37\％ |
| Massachusetts | 50 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 2．10\％ |
| New Hampshire | 9 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0．39\％ |
| Vermont | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0．23\％ |
| Canada | 28 | 13 | 43 | 19 | 38 | 6 | 147 | 3．40\％ |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 76 | 145 | 3．35\％ |
| Oklahoma | \％\％\％\％ | \％ | 2 | 6 |  |  | 8 | 0．18\％ |
| Nebraska |  |  | 1 | 0 | \＆ 4 \＆ | \％ | 1 | 0．02\％ |
| Georgia |  |  | 46 | 122 |  |  | 168 | 3．88\％ |
| Arkansas |  | M／1＊ | 15 | 20 |  | 为 | 35 | 0．81\％ |
| Missouri |  |  | 3 | 3 | － |  | 6 | 0．14\％ |
| Maine | \＃＊） | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 28 | 9 | ＊＊ |  | 37 | 0．86\％ |
| Texas | ＊＊＊） | \＄ | 41 | 94 |  |  | 135 | 3．12\％ |
| Mississippi |  | \＆ | 11 | 19 | \％${ }^{\text {m }}$ | \％s | 30 | 0．69\％ |
| Alabama |  |  | 22 | 53 |  |  | 75 | 1．73\％ |
| Florida |  |  | 14 | 39 | ＊＊ | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 53 | 1．23\％ |
| Louisiana |  |  | 14 | 16 |  |  | 30 | 0．69\％ |
| Minnesota |  |  | 0 | 1 | \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ， 4 ， 2 ， 2 ， | 1 | 0．02\％ |
| Wisconsin |  | \＆ | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 0．07\％ |
| Indiana |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 0．07\％ |
| Illinois |  |  | 3 | 6 |  | ＜ | 9 | 0．21\％ |
| lowa |  | \＆$\lll \ll$ | 0 | 3 |  | 䜌䊽 | 3 | 0．07\％ |
| California | ＜${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 19 | 39 |  | \％ | 58 | 1．34\％ |
| Washington |  |  | 2 | 1 | 紬䊽 | \％ | 3 | 0．07\％ |
| Michigan |  |  | 11 | 3 |  |  | 14 | 0．32\％ |
| Nevada |  | 为 4 \＆ | 0 | 2 |  | ， | 2 | 0．05\％ |
| New Mexico |  |  | 0 | 2 | \＄${ }_{\text {\％}}$ | \＄$\%$ \＄$\$$ \＄ | 2 | 0．05\％ |
| Arizona |  |  | 3 | 7 |  |  | 10 | 0．23\％ |
| Total | 1682 | 1507 | 342 | 548 | 131 | 116 | 4326 | 100．00\％ |
| Percent of Total | 38．88\％ | 34．84\％ | 7．91\％ | 12．67\％ | 3．03\％ | 2．68\％ | 100\％ |  |



Figure 4.2: Violating Truck Origins and Destinations using I-81 (Source: VDOT's Stephens City Weigh Station 1/1/95-6/8/95)

With $78 \%$ of the truck origins or destinations and $85 \%$ of the automobile trips existing within the corridor defined by the proposed methodology, this corridor boundary is a good definition of the potential market of users traveling on I-81. Section 4.4 will identify where travel occurs outside this boundary using a national study completed by Argonne National Laboratory.

### 4.4 O-D pairs outside the I-81 Corridor Boundary

The corridor defined by the proposed methodology is assumed to account for $85 \%$ of all automobile trips and approximately $78 \%$ of all truck origins and destinations. The next logical step is to discuss what happens outside the corridor boundary. Therefore, an attempt has been made to analyze which O-D pairs throughout the United States would be expected to use I-81. Based on the above assumptions, approximately $15 \%$ of all automobile trips and approximately $22 \%$ of all truck trips who use I-81 are expected to have an origin or destination outside the defined corridor boundary according to the proposed methodology.

Using a nationwide origin-destination study completed by Argonne National Laboratories (1993), 597 origin-destination pairs were identified as using I-81 in their shortest time paths. Argonne estimated the number of highway person trips in 1988 for 78 cities and created a 78 x 78 O-D matrix to determine the feasibility of implementing maglev systems. This data is assumed to not be biased towards any particular mode and was used in conjunction with the AUTOMAP software package to determine whether Interstate 81 was included in the shortest time path. The number of estimated highway person trips could then be determined for those using I-81. As a result, 10,234,000 person trips were estimated to use $\mathrm{I}-81$ in 1988. This is approximately $3.2 \%$ of the total number of trips estimated nationwide (See Table A-5 and A-6 in the Appendix for a summary and complete listing of these O-D pairs). I-81's 850 miles composes $2 \%$ of the entire length of the interstate system. Of the 78 cities in the study, 57 cities (or $73 \%$ ) were outside the defined corridor boundary. These cities accounted for $20 \%$ of the highway trips
with $2,070,000$ person trips having an origin or destination outside the corridor boundary. Figures 4.3 through 4.9 show many of the O-D pairs expected to use I-81 with major cities such as New York, Boston, Washington D.C., Miami, Houston, Texas, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Figure 4.3 shows the O-D pairs between which trips are expected to use I-81 to get to or from New York City. A total of $2,341,000$ person trips were expected to used I-81 in 1988 to access or leave New York City. It appears that I-80 captures most of the traffic north of the Phoenix Albuquerque - Kansas City Line. I-95 captures most of the traffic in the eastern halves of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and most of Florida.

Figure 4.4 displays the O-D pairs between which travelers to or from Boston, Massachusetts, are expected to use I-81. A total of 417,000 person trips were expected to use I-81 in 1988 to connect with Boston. Most of the 78 cities accessing Boston using some portion of I-81; however, cities to the north and immediately to the west, such as Syracuse, use other interstates to access Boston.

Figure 4.5 depicts the O-D pairs between which trips are expected to use I-81 to get to or from Washington D.C. As a result, a total of 139,000 person trips were expected to use I-81 in 1988 to access or leave Washington, D.C. It appears that I-70 to the west and I-95 to the north and south capture most of the person trips traveling to the nation's capital; however, cities as far as Tucson, Arizona are expected to use I-81 to visit Washington D.C.

Figure 4.6 shows the O-D pairs between which travelers to or from Atlanta, Georgia are expected to use I-81. In 1988, 198,000 person trips were expected to use I-81 to connect with Atlanta. It appears that most of West Virginia and Virginia, and all of the states north of Pennsylvania, use I-81 when traveling to Atlanta.

Figure 4.7 presents the O-D pairs between which trips are expected to use I-81 to get to or from four cities in Florida: Miami, Tampa, Orlando, and Jacksonville. As a result, a total of 620,000 person trips were expected to use some portion of I-81 in 1988 to access or leave these four Florida cities. It appears that I-81 is the main connection between Eastern Ohio, Ontario, Canada, Western Pennsylvania and these four cities.

Figure 4.8 depicts the O-D pairs between which travelers are expected to use I-81 to travel to or from Dallas and Houston, Texas. In 1988, 246,000 person trips were expected to use I-81 to access or leave these two Texas cities. It appears that I- 81 is the main connection between several key Northeast cities and Dallas and Houston.

Figure 4.9 shows the O-D pairs between Los Angeles and other cities where travelers are expected to use I-81. Only 34,000 person trips were expected in 1988 to use some portion of I-81 to access or leave Los Angeles. It appears that I-81's role on this cross country trip is quite limited.


Figure 4.3: New York O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.4: Boston O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.5: Washington DC O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.6: Atlanta O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.7: Florida O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.8: Dallas and Houston O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81


Figure 4.9: Los Angeles O-D Pairs expected to use a portion of I-81

### 4.5 Summary

In conclusion, the I-81 corridor boundary definition was determined using shortest time path and macroscopic traveler modal choice criteria. This boundary is expected to represent $85 \%$ of automobile travel (BTS, 1994) and $78 \%$ of truck travel. The truck origins and destinations were verified using the best available data; however, the effects of using 'violator-only' data from weigh stations are not known. The origins and destinations outside the boundary that are expected to use I-81 in its shortest time path are assumed to account for most of the remaining $15 \%$ of automobile travel and $22 \%$ of truck travel. Further discussion of the results will occur in Section 5.0

### 5.0 Conclusions

In today's planning applications, new partnerships and organizations have formed as a result of advancing transportation technologies developed under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. Corridor coalitions have provided the necessary framework for the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) on a corridor-wide basis. The new transportation bill of 1997 is projected to support this type of planning application well into the next century, and there will be a growing need to define corridor boundaries as more coalitions are formed. A methodology to set these corridor boundaries quickly with or without elaborate data collection is necessary as planners begin to analyze the needs of corridors. The proposed methodology presented in Section 3.0 fulfills the need for a preliminary definition.

The proposed methodology presented within this report used shortest path criteria and traveler modal choice to define the potential market of users for I-81. The criteria for a major origin or destination to be included in the corridor is based upon three parameters:

- City size is over 50,000 in population
- O-D pair must be within the shortest path distance of 368 miles
- The O-D pair must use I-81

Within the region defined by the corridor and based on study assumptions, $85 \%$ of the automobile travel and approximately $78 \%$ of the truck travel have an origin or destination within the corridor boundary (See Figure 5.1).


Figure 5.1: I-81 Corridor Boundary for cities over 50,000
(AUTOMAP software used to generate map)
The proposed methodology has several strengths. The corridor definition presented is a practical and easily generated boundary that depicts the potential market of interstate highway users. Planners want to define their study area as quickly and as accurately as possible so that other planning applications can begin. The corridor boundary definition presented here expedites the definition process. In addition, this boundary definition is very flexible as it can be applied to any particular city, group of cities, or roadways to determine what other cities interact within a 350 mile region, and what shortest time paths are used. The major weaknesses of the corridor definition arise when discussing the
validity of the results. Since no previous methodology exists for this type of boundary definition, it is very difficult to base any of this report's results on what has been completed in the past. The only way to validate this kind of study is through the use of origin-destination data. Currently, there are no data sources known to validate this kind of study. The truck origin-destination data received from the Stephens City, Virginia, weigh station may be skewed since it is based on a sample of all the truckers that violated regulations and received citations.

Validation of the corridor boundary is one particular area that needs further research. Gathering origin-destination data should be an integral part of the validating process. Secondly, it is important to realize that this is only one type of corridor boundary definition. Research using the graph theory principles and accessibility models discussed in the literature review may be analyzed further to possibly create another type of border where the interstate system is compared to the drainage system which Haggett suggested (1969). Another method could be formed based on traffic flow characteristics and supply-demand relationships.

The I-81 corridor boundary definition based on traveler choice is a quick and easy methodology to define corridors such as I-81. It uses the shortest time paths and a cutoff distance of 368 miles ( $5 \%$ greater than 350 miles). Based on study assumptions, $85 \%$ of automobile travel and approximately $78 \%$ of truck travel have an origin or destination within this boundary. Based on Argonne National Laboratories data (1993), $3.2 \%$ of all person trips made in 1988 can be expected to use I-81 in their shortest time paths. In general, this boundary definition seems
logical and appropriate; however, future research and validation of this boundary definition needs to be performed before this definition can be fully accepted.
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## Appendix

Table A-1: Cities over 50,000 within I-81's North Corridor

|  |  | Syracuse |  |  | Binghamton |  |  | Scranton |  |  | Harrisburg |  |  | Wilkes Barre |  |  | Rochester |  |  | Altoona |  |  | Pittsburgh |  |  | Buffalo |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Syracuse | NY | 0 | N | 0 | 80 | Y | 1 | 131 | Y | 1 | 246 | Y | 1 | 148 | Y | 1 | 88 | N | 0 | 269 | Y | 1 | 373 | N | 0 | 163 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Binghamton | NY | 80 | Y | 1 | 0 | N | 0 | 59 | Y | 1 | 175 | Y | 1 | 77 | $Y$ | 1 | 142 | N | 0 | 229 | N | 0 | 336 | N | 0 | 205 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Scranton | PA | 131 | $Y$ | 1 | 59 | Y | 1 | 0 | N | - | 116 | Y | 1 | 18 | N | 0 | 201 | $Y$ | 1 | 184 | $Y$ | 1 | 291 | $Y$ | 1 | 246 | N | 0 | 6 |
| Harrisburg | PA | 246 | $Y$ | 1 | 175 | Y | 1 | 116 | Y | 1 | 0 | N | 0 | 116 | Y | 1 | 260 | N | 0 | 129 | N | 0 | 212 | Y | 1 | 300 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Wilkes Barre | PA | 148 | Y | 1 | 77 | $Y$ | 1 | 18 | N | 0 | 101 | Y | 1 | 0 | N | 0 | 202 | $N$ | 0 | 166 | $N$ | 0 | 273 | N | 0 | 247 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Rochester | NY | 88 | N | 0 | 142 | N | 0 | 201 | Y | 1 | 260 | N | 0 | 202 | N | 0 | 0 | N | 0 | 260 | N | 0 | 291 | N | 0 | 81 | N | 0 | 1 |
| Altoona | PA | 269 | $Y$ | 1 | 229 | N | 0 | 184 | $Y$ | 1 | 129 | N | 0 | 166 | N | 0 | 260 | N | 0 | 0 | N | 0 | $10^{\prime}$ | N | 0 | 220 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Pittsburg | PA | 373 | N | 0 | 336 | N | 0 | 291 | Y | 1 | 212. | Y | 1 | 273 | N | 0 | 292 | N | 0 | 101 | N | 0 | 0 | N | 0 | 220 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Buffalo | NY | 163 | N | 0 | 205 | N | 0 | 246 | N | - | 300 | N | 0 | 247 | N | 0 | 81 | N | 0 | 220 | N | 0 | 220 | N | 0 | 0 | N | 0 | 0 |
| Erie | PA | 255 | N | 0 | 275 | N | 0 | 308 | Y | 1 | 269 | N | 0 | 291 | N | 0 | 173 | N | 0 | 181 | N | 0 | 123 | N | 0 | 101 | N | 0 | 1 |
| Albany | NY | 154 | N | 0 | 135 | Y | 1 | 176 | Y | 1 | 280 | $Y$ | 1 | 193 | $Y$ | 1 | 238 | N | 0 | 356 | $Y$ | 1 | 461 | $Y$ | 0 | 313 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Schenectady | NY | 139 | N | 0 | 128 | $Y$ | 1 | 179 | $Y$ | 1 | 294 | $Y$ | 1 | 196 | $Y$ | 1 | 224 | N | 0 | 349 | $Y$ | 1 | 456 | $Y$ | 0 | 298 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Troy | NY | 154 | N | 0 | 143 | $Y$ | 1 | 184 | Y | 1 | 288 | Y |  | 201 | $Y$ | 1 | 238 | N | 0 | 364 | Y | 1 | 471 | Y | 0 | 313 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Utica | NY | 56 | $N$ | 0 | 97 | Y | 1 | 148 | Y | 1 | 263 | $Y$ | 1 | 165 | $Y$ | 1 | 141 | N | 0 | 318 | Y | 1 | 429 | N | 0 | 215 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Pittsfield | MA | 196 | N | 0 | 178 | Y | 1 | 192 | Y | 1 | 296 | Y | 1 | 209 | $Y$ | 1 | 280 | N | 0 | 374 | Y | 0 | 482 | Y | 0 | 355 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Springfield | MA | 243 | N | 0 | 225 | $Y$ | 1 | 213 | Y | 1 | 311 | $Y$ | 1 | 230 | $Y$ | 1 | 328 | N | 0 | 396 | Y | 0 | 503 | $Y$ | 0 | 402 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Chicopee | MA | 240 | N | 0 | 221 | Y | 1 | 212 | $Y$ | 1 | 316 | $Y$ | 1 | 230 | $Y$ | 1 | 324 | N | 0 | 395 | Y | 0 | 502 | $Y$ | 0 | 399 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Worchester | MA | 291 | N | 0 | 273 | $Y$ | 1 | 250 | $Y$ | 1 | 348 | Y | 1 | 267 | $Y$ | 1 | 375 | N | 0 | 432 | $Y$ | 0 | 539 | $Y$ | 0 | 450 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Framingham | MA | 308 | N | 0 | 290 | $Y$ | 1 | 267 | $Y$ | 1 | 365 | Y | 1 | 284 | $Y$ | 1 | 392 | N | 0 | 449 | $Y$ | 0 | 556 | Y | 0 | 467 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Boston | MA | 321 | N | 0 | 315 | Y | 1 | 292 | $Y$ | 1 | 390 | $Y$ | 0 | 310 | $Y$ | 1 | 405 | N | 0 | 475 | $Y$ | 0 | 582 | $Y$ | 0 | 480 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Newton | MA | 324 | $N$ | 0 | 307 | Y | 1 | 283 | $Y$ | 1 | 381 | $Y$ | 0 | 300 | Y | 1 | 408 | N | 0 | 465 | $Y$ | 0 | 572 | Y | 0 | 483 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Quincy | MA | 340 | N | 0 | 321 | Y | 1 | 299 | $Y$ | 1 | 393 | Y | 0 | 316 | Y | 1 | 425 | N | 0 | 481 | $Y$ | 0 | 588 | $Y$ | 0 | 499 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Brockton | MA | 347 | N | 0 | 315 | $Y$ | 1 | 305 | $Y$ | 1 | 390 | $Y$ | 0 | 322 | $Y$ | 1 | 431 | N | 0 | 488 | N | 0 | 595 | N | 0 | 506 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Lynn | MA | 331 | N | 0 | 328 | $Y$ | 1 | 300 | $Y$ | 1 | 403 | $Y$ | 0 | 322 | Y | 1 | 415 | N | 0 | 487 | Y | 0 | 594 | Y | 0 | 490 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Weymout | MA | 340 | N | 0 | 322 | $Y$ | 1 | 297 | $Y$ | 1 | 392 | $Y$ | 0 | 316 | $Y$ | 1 | 424 | N | 0 | 481 | $Y$ | 0 | 588 | Y | 0 | 499 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Lowell | MA | 306 | N | 0 | 295 | $Y$ | 1 | 291 | $Y$ | 1 | 389 | Y | 0 | 308 | $Y$ | 1 | 391 | N | 0 | 473 | $Y$ | 0 | 580 | Y | 0 | 465 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Lawerence | MA | 317 | N | 0 | 306 | Y | 1 | 302 | $Y$ | 1 | 400 | Y | 0 | 319 | $Y$ | 1 | 402 | N | 0 | 484 | Y | 0 | 591 | $Y$ | 0 | 476 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Fall River | MA | 350 | N | 0 | 321 | N | 0 | 280 | $Y$ | 1 | 368 | $Y$ | 0 | 297 | Y | 1 | 434 | N | 0 | 465 | N | 0 | 572 | N | 0 | 509 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Nashua | NH | 291 | N | 0 | 280 | Y |  | 303 | Y |  | 401 | $Y$ |  | 320 | Y |  | 375 | N | 0 | 485 | Y | 0 | 592 | Y | 0 | 450 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Manchester | NH | 300 | N | 0 | 289 | Y |  | 315 | Y | 1 | 413 | $Y$ | 0 | 332 | $Y$ | 1 | 384 | N | 0 | 497 | $Y$ | 0 | 604 | $Y$ | 0 | 459 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Pawtucket | RI | 328 | N | 0 | 306 | N | 0 | 265 | Y | 1 | 355 | $Y$ | 0 | 282 | $Y$ | 1 | 413 | N | 0 | 447 | Y | 0 | 554 | Y | 0 | 487 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Providence | RI | 331 | N | 0 | 302 | N | 0 | 262 | Y | 1 | 351 | Y | 0 | 279 | Y | 1 | 416 | N | 0 | 449 | N | 0 | 556 | N | 0 | 490 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Wanwick | RI | 338 | N | 0 | 300 | N | 0 | 265 | $Y$ | 1 | 345 | Y | 0 | 276 | $Y$ | 1 | 423 | N | 0 | 442 | N | 0 | 549 | N | 0 | 497 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Hartford | CT | 263 | N | 0 | 227 | N | 0 | 185 | $Y$ | 1 | 289 | Y | 1 | 204 | $Y$ | 1 | 347 | N | 0 | 369 | $Y$ | 1 | 476 | Y | 0 | 422 | N | 0 | 4 |
| New Britain | CT | 265 | N | 0 | 216 | N | 0 | 176 | $Y$ | 1 | 274 | Y | 0 | 193 | Y | 1 | 350 | N | 0 | 358 | $Y$ | 1 | 465 | Y | 0 | 422 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Bristol | CT | 263 | N | 0 | 216 | N | 0 | 175 | $Y$ | 1 | 273 | Y | 1 | 192 | $Y$ | 1 | 347 | N | 0 | 357 | $Y$ | 1 | 464 | $Y$ | 0 | 422 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Meriden | CT | 279 | N | 0 | 215 | N | 0 | 175 | Y | 1 | 274 | Y | 1 | 191 | Y | 1 | 363 | N | 0 | 356 | $Y$ | 1 | 463 | Y | 0 | 420 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Waterbury | CT | 265 | N | 0 | 201 | N | 0 | 160 | Y | 1 | 258 | Y | 1 | 177 | Y | 1 | 350 | N | 0 | 343 | Y | 1 | 450 | Y | 0 | 406 | N | 0 | 4 |
| New Haven | CT | 279 | Y | 1 | 207 | N | 0 | 167 | Y | 1 | 253 | Y | 1 | 184 | Y |  | 349 | N | 0 | 350 | N | 0 | 457 | N | 0 | 413 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Danbury | CT | 246 | Y | 1 | 174 | N | 0 | 133 | $Y$ | 1 | 232 | Y | 1 | 150 | Y | 1 | 316 | N | 0 | 316 | $Y$ | 1 | 423 | Y | 0 | 379 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Stamford | CT | 258 | Y | 1 | 187 | N | 0 | 144 | Y | 1 | 216 | Y | 1 | 163 | N | 0 | 329 | N | 0 | 313 | N | 0 | 420 | N | 0 | 392 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Bridgeport | CT | 274 | Y | 1 | 203 | N | 0 | 162 | $Y$ | 1 | 235 | Y | 1 | 182 | N | 0 | 345 | N | 0 | 332 | N | 0 | 439 | N | 0 | 408 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Norwalk | CT | 264 | Y | 1 | 193 | N | 0 | 149 | Y |  | 222 | Y | 1 | 169 | N | 0 | 335 | N | 0 | 319 | N | 0 | 426 | N | 0 | 398 | N | 0 | 3 |
| New Rochelle | NY | 251 | Y | 1 | 180 | N | 0 | 133 | N | 0 | 189 | Y | 1 | 137 | N | 0 | 322 | N | 0 | 287 | N | 0 | 394 | N | 0 | 386 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Yonkers | NY | 246 | Y | 1 | 175 | N | , | 132 | Y | 1 | 185 | Y | 1 | 132 | N | 0 | 317 | N | 0 | 282 | N | 0 | 389 | N | 0 | 380 | N | 0 | 3 |
| New York | NY | 248 | Y | 1 | 176 | Y | 1 | 118 | N | 0 | 164 | Y | 1 | 122 | N | 0 | 319 | $Y$ | 1 | 272 | N | 0 | 373 | Y | 0 | 365 | Y | 1 | 5 |
| Paterson | NJ | 237 | $Y$ | 1 | 166 | $Y$ | 1 | 108 | N | 0 | 164 | Y | 1 | 111 | N |  | 308 | $Y$ |  | 261 | N | 0 | 368 | N | 0 | 354 | Y | 1 | 5 |

## 1 Shortest Time Path between Origin and Destination from Automap

$2 \mathrm{Y}=$ Uses I-81; N = Does not use I-81
31 = O-D Pair included in Corridor; $0=$ Does not meet criteria

|  |  | Syracuse |  |  | Binghamton |  |  | Scranton |  |  | Harrisburg |  |  | Wilkes Barre |  |  | Rochester |  |  | Altoona |  |  | Pittsburgh |  |  | Buffalo |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Newa | NJ | 239 | Y | 1 | 168 | Y | 1 | 110 | N | 0 | 157 | Y | 1 | 114 | N | 0 | 310 | Y | 1 | 264 | N | 0 | 366 | Y | 1 | 356 | Y |  | 6 |
| Union City | NJ | 247 | Y | 1 | 176 | Y | 1 | 117 | N | 0 | 166 | Y | 1 | 121 | N | 0 | 317 | Y | 1 | 271 | N | 0 | 376 | Y | 0 | 363 | Y | 1 | 5 |
| Jersey City | NJ | 244 | $Y$ | 1 | 173 | $Y$ | 1 | 115 | N | 0 | 160 | $Y$ | 1 | 119 | N | 0 | 315 | Y | 1 | 269 | N | 0 | 370 | Y | 0 | 361 | Y | 1 | 5 |
| Bayonne | NJ | 246 | Y | 1 | 175 | Y | 1 | 117 | N | 0 | 158 | Y | 1 | 120 | N | 0 | 317 | Y | 1 | 271 | N | 0 | 368 | Y | 1 | 363 | Y |  | 6 |
| Elizabeth | NJ | 245 | Y | 1 | 173 | $Y$ | 1 | 115 | N | 0 | 157 | Y | 1 | 119 | N | 0 | 316 | Y | 1 | 269 | N | 0 | 367 | Y | 1 | 362 | Y |  | 6 |
| E Orange | NJ | 234 | Y | 1 | 163 | Y | 1 | 105 | N | 0 | 155 | Y | 1 | 108 | N | 0 | 305 | Y | 1 | 258 | N | 0 | 367 | N | 0 | 351 | Y |  | 5 |
| Reading | PA | 232 | $Y$ | 1 | 160 | $Y$ | 1 | 101 | Y | 1 | 57 | N | 0 | 87 | $Y$ | 1 | 276 | N | 0 | 200 | N | 0 | 270 | N | 0 | 321 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Allentown | PA | 204 | $Y$ | 1 | 133 | $Y$ | 1 | 75 | N | 0 | 82 | $Y$ | 1 | 68 | N | 0 | 275 | Y | 1 | 203 | N | 0 | 292 | Y | 1 | 315 | N | 0 | 5 |
| Trenton | NJ | 243 | Y | 1 | 172 | Y | 1 | 114 | N | 0 | 136 | N | 0 | 117 | N | 0 | 314 | Y | 1 | 275 | N | 0 | 344 | N | 0 | 360 | Y |  | 4 |
| Philadelphia | PA | 255 | $Y$ | 1 | 184 | $Y$ | 1 | 126 | N | 0 | 111 | N | 0 | 123 | N | 0 | 326 | Y | 1 | 251 | N | 0 | 320 | N | 0 | 370 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Camden | NJ | 260 | Y | 1 | 189 | $Y$ | 1 | 131 | N | 0 | 116 | N | 0 | 128 | N | 0 | 331 | Y | 1 | 256 | $N$ | 0 | 325 | N | 0 | 375 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Vineland | NJ | 287 | Y | 1 | 216 | Y | 1 | 158 | N | 0 | 123 | N | 0 | 157 | N | 0 | 358 | Y | 1 | 262 | N | 0 | 331 | N | 0 | 404 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Wilmington | DE | 273 | Y | 1 | 202 | Y | 1 | 143 | N | 0 | 90 | N | 0 | 133 | N | 0 | 332 | N | 0 | 229 | N | 0 | 298 | N | 0 | 377 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Lancaster | PA | 255 | Y | 1 | 183 | Y | 1 | 124 | $Y$ | 1 | 38 | $N$ | 0 | 110 | $Y$ | 1 | 289 | Y | 1 | 177 | N | 0 | 246 | N | 0 | 329 | Y | 1 | 6 |
| Towson | MD | 316 | Y | 1 | 245 | $Y$ | 1 | 186 | $Y$ | 1 | 72 | N | 0 | 175 | $Y$ | 1 | 332 | N | 0 | 169 | N | 0 | 238 | N | 0 | 372 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Baltimore | MD | 327 | $Y$ | 1 | 256 | $Y$ | 1 | 197 | $Y$ | 1 | 79 | N | 0 | 182 | $Y$ | 1 | 340 | N | 0 | 175 | N | 0 | 244 | N | 0 | 380 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Columbia | MD | 340 | $Y$ | 1 | 269 | $Y$ | 1 | 208 | $Y$ | 1 | 92 | N | 0 | 195 | $Y$ | 1 | 353 | N | 0 | 174 | N | 0 | 244 | N | 0 | 379 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Silver Springs | MD | 358 | Y | 1 | 287 | $Y$ | 1 | 228 | $Y$ | 1 | 110 | N | 0 | 213 | $Y$ | 1 | 371 | N | 0 | 167 | N | 0 | 236 | N | 0 | 372 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Bethesda | MD | 363 | Y | 1 | 291 | $Y$ | 1 | 232 | $Y$ | 1 | 115 | N | 0 | 218 | $Y$ | 1 | 370 | N | 0 | 16 | N | 0 | 230 | N | 0 | 366 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Washington | DC | 365 | Y | 1 | 294 | $Y$ | 1 | 235 | $Y$ | 1 | 117 | N | 0 | 220 | Y | 1 | 380 | N | 0 | 172 | N | 0 | 241 | N | 0 | 376 | N | 0 | 4 |
| Alexandria | VA | 372 | Y | 0 | 305 | $Y$ | 1 | 243 | $Y$ | 1 | 125 | N | 0 | 228 | Y | 1 | 386 | N | 0 | 185 | N | 0 | 254 | N | 0 | 389 | N | 0 | 3 |
| Richmond | VA | 474 | Y | 0 | 402 | Y | 0 | 343 | $Y$ | 1 | 226 | N | 0 | 329 | Y |  | 481 | N | 0 | 272 | N | 0 | 341 | N | 0 | 477 | N | 0 | 2 |
| Canton | OH | 352 | N | 0 | 388 | N | 0 | 360 | $Y$ | 1 | 306 | Y | 1 | 345 | N | 0 |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  | W綬 |  | $\pm$ | 2 |
| Akron | OH | 377 | N | 0 | 369 | N | 0 | 343 | $Y$ | 1 | 303 | N | 0 | 325 | N | 0 |  |  | W |  |  |  | ＋2 |  |  |  |  | \％ | 1 |
| Warren | OH | 336 | N | 0 | 333 | N | 0 | 307 | $Y$ | 1 | 268 | N | 0 | 289 | N | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Youngstown | OH | 346 | N | 0 | 366 | N | 0 | 299 | Y | 1 | 259 | N | 0 | 281 | N | 0 | W | \％ | 3 3 |  | 3 | Y |  |  | 4 |  |  | ， | 1 |
| Euclid | OH | 339 | N | 0 | 354 | N | 0 | 363 | Y | 1 | 324 | N | 0 | 346 | N | 0 |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  | 3x ${ }^{\text {x }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Cleveland | OH | 339 | N | 0 | 366 | N | 0 | 365 | Y | 1 | 326 | N | 0 | 348 | N | 0 |  | 綧 | 煖 | ＋ |  |  | 2888 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Ottawa | ON | 213 | $Y$ | 1 | 292 | Y | 1 | 343 | $Y$ | 1 | 458 | Y | 0 | 360 | Y | ， | 277 | Y | 1 | 482 | $Y$ | 0 | 568 | Y | 0 | 358 | Y | 1 | 6 |
| Montreal | PQ | 269 | $Y$ | 1 | 348 | $Y$ | 1 | 399 | $Y$ | 0 | 514 | $Y$ | 0 | 416 | Y | 0 | 333 | Y | 1 | 537 | $Y$ | 0 | 624 | N | － | 414 | Y | 0 | 3 |
| Oshawa | ON | 272 | Y | 1 | 351 | Y | 1 | 402 | Y | 0 | 443 | N | 0 | 390 | N | 0 | 214 | N | 0 | 363 | N | 0 | 363 | N | 0 | 143 | N | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  | 37 |  |  | 49 |  |  | 58 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 44 |  |  | 17 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 11 | 269 |

1 Shortest Time Path between Origin and Destination from Automap
$2 \mathrm{Y}=$ Uses I－81； $\mathrm{N}=$ Does not use I－81
31 ＝O－D Pair included in Corridor； $0=$ Does not meet criteria

Table A-2: Cities over 50,000 within I-81's Central Corridor

|  |  | Bristol VA |  |  | Roanoke VA |  |  | Winchester, VA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Huntsville | AL | 331 | Y | 1 | 475 | Y | 0 | 640 | N | 0 |
| Bridgeport | CT | 660 | Y | 0 | 527 | $Y$ | 0 | 348 | Y | 1 |
| Danbury | CT | 656 | Y | 0 | 523 | $Y$ | 0 | 345 | Y | 1 |
| New Haven | CT | 678 | $Y$ | 0 | 545 | $Y$ | 0 | 366 | $Y$ | 1 |
| Norwalk | CT | 646 | Y | 0 | 514 | Y | 0 | 335 | Y | 1 |
| Stamford | CT | 641 | $Y$ | 0 | 508 | Y | 0 | 329 | Y | 1 |
| Waterbury | CT | 683 | $Y$ | 0 | 551 | Y | 0 | 372 | Y | 0 |
| Washington | DC | 373 | $Y$ | 0 | 240 | Y | 1 | 76 | N | 0 |
| Dover | DE | 473 | Y | 0 | 340 | Y | 1 | 176 | N | 0 |
| Wilmington | DE | 482 | Y | 0 | 349 | $Y$ | 1 | 173 | N | 0 |
| Atlanta | GA | 290 | N | 0 | 422 | N | 0 | 602 | Y | 0 |
| Macon | GA | 344 | N | 0 | 468 | N | 0 | 648 | Y | 0 |
| Frankfort | KY | 257 | N | 0 | 373 | Y | 0 | 444 | N | 0 |
| Lexington | KY | 229 | N | 0 | 347 | $Y$ | 1 | 419 | N | 0 |
| Louisville | KY | 301 | N | 0 | 417 | Y | 0 | 489 | N | 0 |
| Annapolis | MD | 406 | $Y$ | 0 | 274 | $Y$ | 1 | 110 | N | 0 |
| Baltimore | MD | 409 | Y | 0 | 277 | $Y$ | 1 | 100 | N | 0 |
| Bethesda | MD | 372 | $Y$ | 0 | 240 | $Y$ | 1 | 74 | N | 0 |
| Columbia | MD | 393 | Y | 0 | 260 | Y | 1 | 95 | N | 0 |
| Silver Springs | MD | 378 | Y | 0 | 246 | $Y$ | 1 | 80 | N | 0 |
| Towson | MD | 416 | Y | 0 | 283 | $Y$ | 1 | 106 | N | 0 |
| Asheville | NC | 91 | N | 0 | 237 | Y | 1 | 401 | Y | 0 |
| Charlotte | NC | 153 | N | 0 | 184 | N | 0 | 365 | Y | 1 |
| Durham | NC | 223 | N | 0 | 155 | N | 0 | 281 | Y | 1 |
| Fayetteville | NC | 266 | N | 0 | 198 | N | 0 | 350 | N | 0 |
| Greensboro | NC | 171 | N | 0 | 102 | N | 0 | 281 | Y | 1 |
| High Point | NC | 163 | N | 0 | 120 | N | 0 | 297 | Y | 1 |
| Raleigh | NC | 247 | N | 0 | 179 | N | 0 | 299 | N | 0 |
| Winston Salem | NC | 144 | N | 0 | 109 | N | 0 | 288 | Y | 1 |
| Bayonne | NJ | 583 | $Y$ | 0 | 450 | $Y$ | 0 | 272 | $Y$ | 1 |
| E Orange | NJ | 580 | $Y$ | 0 | 447 | $Y$ | 0 | 268 | Y | 1 |
| Elizabeth | NJ | 582 | $Y$ | 0 | 449 | $Y$ | 0 | 270 | Y | 1 |
| Jersey City | NJ | 585 | Y | 0 | 452 | $Y$ | 0 | 273 | Y | 1 |
| Newark | NJ | 581 | Y | 0 | 449 | $Y$ | 0 | 270 | Y | 1 |
| Paterson | NJ | 589 | Y | 0 | 456 | Y | 0 | 277 | $Y$ | 1 |
| Trenton | NJ | 559 | Y | 0 | 427 | Y | 0 | 248 | Y | 1 |
| Union City | NJ | 591 | Y | 0 | 458 | $Y$ | 0 | 279 | Y | 1 |
| Vineland | NJ | 512 | $Y$ | 0 | 379 | $Y$ | 0 | 203 | N | 0 |
| Binghampton | NY | 600 | Y | 0 | 467 | $Y$ | 0 | 288 | Y | 1 |
| Buffalo | NY | 590 | Y | 0 | 529 | $Y$ | 0 | 341 | N | 0 |
| New Rochelle | NY | 614 | Y | 0 | 482 | $Y$ | 0 | 303 | Y | 1 |
| New York | NY | 589 | $Y$ | 0 | 456 | $Y$ | 0 | 277 | Y | 1 |
| Niagra Falls | NY | 608 | Y | 0 | 547 | $Y$ | 0 | 359 | N | 0 |
| Rochester | NY | 661 | Y | 0 | 540 | $Y$ | 0 | 361 | Y | 1 |

1 Shortest Time Path between Origin and Destination from Automap (Miles)
$2 \mathrm{Y}=$ Uses I-81; $\mathrm{N}=$ Does not use I-81
31 = O-D pair included in the Corridor; $0=$ Does not meet criteria

|  |  | Bristol VA |  |  | Roanoke VA |  |  | Winchester, VA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Syracuse | NY | 671 | Y | 0 | 538 | $Y$ | 0 | 359 | Y | 1 |
| Yonkers | NY | 610 | Y | 0 | 477 | Y | 0 | 298 | Y | 1 |
| Akron | OH | 406 | Y | 0 | 385 | Y | 0 | 300 | N | 0 |
| Canton | OH | 384 | Y | 0 | 363 | Y | 1 | 265 | N | 0 |
| Cincinnati | OH | 313 | N | 0 | 378 | $Y$ | 0 | 422 | N | 0 |
| Cleveland | OH | 444 | Y | 0 | 423 | Y | 0 | 327 | N | 0 |
| Columbus | OH | 341 | Y | 1 | 344 | Y | 1 | 321 | N | 0 |
| Dayton | OH | 361 | N | 0 | 378 | Y | 0 | 393 | N | 0 |
| Elyria | OH | 456 | Y | 0 | 434 | Y | 0 | 344 | N | 0 |
| Euclid | OH | 454 | Y | 0 | 433 | $Y$ | 0 | 329 | N | 0 |
| Lorain | OH | 457 | $Y$ | 0 | 435 | Y | 0 | 345 | N | 0 |
| Mansfield | OH | 414 | $Y$ | 0 | 392 | Y | 0 | 321 | N | 0 |
| Springfield | OH | 367 | $Y$ | 1 | 385 | $Y$ | 0 | 367 | N | 0 |
| Warren | OH | 449 | Y | 0 | 383 | $Y$ | 0 | 274 | N | 0 |
| Youngstown | OH | 428 | Y | 0 | 367 | Y | 1 | 258 | N | 0 |
| Allentown | PA | 507 | $Y$ | 0 | 374 | $Y$ | 0 | 196 | Y | 1 |
| Altoona | PA | 434 | Y | 0 | 301 | Y | 1 | 122 | N | 0 |
| Erie | PA | 492 | $Y$ | 0 | 431 | $Y$ | 0 | 311 | N | 0 |
| Harrisburg | PA | 427 | Y | 0 | 294 | $Y$ | 1 | 116 | Y | 1 |
| Lancaster | PA | 461 | $Y$ | 0 | 329 | $Y$ | 1 | 150 | Y | 1 |
| Philadelphia | PA | 512 | Y | 0 | 379 | $Y$ | 0 | 203 | N | 0 |
| Pittsburgh | PA | 371 | $Y$ | 0 | 310 | $Y$ | 1 | 180 | N | 0 |
| Reading | PA | 485 | $Y$ | 0 | 352 | $Y$ | 1 | 173 | Y | 1 |
| Scranton | PA | 541 | $Y$ | 0 | 408 | Y | 0 | 229 | Y | 1 |
| Wilkes Barre | PA | 526 | Y | 0 | 393 | Y | 0 | 215 | Y | 1 |
| Charleston | SC | 355 | N | 0 | 380 | N | 0 | 565 | N | 0 |
| Columbia | SC | 246 | N | 0 | 276 | N | 0 | 457 | Y | 0 |
| Greenville | SC | 155 | N | 0 | 278 | N | 0 | 458 | Y | 0 |
| Chattanooga | TN | 224 | Y | 1 | 368 | Y | 1 | 533 | $Y$ | 0 |
| Clarksville | TN | 338 | Y | 1 | 482 | Y | 0 | 647 | Y | 0 |
| Knoxville | TN | 114 | Y | 1 | 258 | Y | 1 | 423 | Y | 0 |
| Nashville | TN | 291 | Y | 1 | 435 | Y | 0 | 600 | Y | 0 |
| Alexandria | VA | 372 | Y | 0 | 239 | Y | 1 | 75 | N | 0 |
| Hampton | VA | 396 | Y | 0 | 243 | N | 0 | 209 | N | 0 |
| Lynchburg | VA | 197 | Y | 0 | 53 | N | 0 | 164 | Y | 1 |
| Newport News | VA | 399 | Y | 0 | 245 | N | 0 | 212 | N | 1 |
| Norfolk | VA | 414 | Y | 0 | 249 | N | 0 | 227 | N | 1 |
| Richmond | VA | 316 | Y | 1 | 167 | N | 0 | 138 | N | 1 |
| Roanoke | VA | 147 | Y | 1 |  | N | 0 | 179 | Y | 1 |
| Virginia Beach | VA | 426 | Y | 0 | 273 | N | 0 | 239 | N | 0 |
| Charleston | WV | 197 | Y | 1 | 176 | Y | 1 | 248 | N | 0 |
| Huntington | WV | 207 | Y | 1 | 226 | Y | 1 | 298 | N | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 35 |

1 Shortest Time Path between Origin and Destination from Automap (Miles)
2 Y = Uses I-81; N = Does not use 1-81
31 = O-D pair included in the Corridor; $0=$ Does not meet criteria
Table A-3: Cities over 50,000 within I-81's Southern Corridor

|  | Lynchburg |  |  | Richmond |  |  | Winston Salem |  |  | Durham |  |  | Greensboro |  |  | High Point |  |  | Raleigh |  |  | Charlotte |  |  | Asheville |  |  | Greenville |  |  | Fayetteville |  |  | Roanoke |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Allentown | 359 | Y | 1 |  | N | 0 | 483 | Y | 0 |  | N | 0 | 476 | Y | 0 | 493 | Y | 0 |  | N | 0 | 560 | Y | 0 | 597 | Y | 0 | 654 | Y | 0 | 493 | N | 0 | 374 | Y | 0 | 1 |
| Altoona | 286 | $Y$ | 1 |  | N | 0 | 410 | $Y$ | 0 | 403 | Y | 0 | 403 | Y | 0 | 419 | Y | 0 |  | N | 0 | 486 | Y | 0 | 523 | Y | 0 | 580 | Y | 0 | 48 | N | 0 | 30 | Y | 1 | 2 |
| Charleston | 213 | $Y$ | 1 | 298 | Y | 1 | 218 | $Y$ | 1 | 294 | Y | 1 | 243 | $Y$ | 1 | 234 | $Y$ | 1 | 318 | Y | 1 | 269 | Y | 1 | 287 | $Y$ | 1 | 362 | Y | 1 | 337 | Y | 1 | 176 | Y | 1 | 12 |
| Harrisburg | 279 | $Y$ | 1 |  | N | 0 | 404 | $Y$ | 0 |  | N | 0 | 396 | $Y$ | 0 | 413 | Y | 0 |  | N | 0 | 480 | Y | 0 | 517 | Y | 0 | 574 | Y | 0 | 437 | N | 0 | 294 | Y | 1 | 2 |
| Huntington | 263 | $Y$ | 1 | 349 | Y | 1 | 268 | Y | 1 | 345 | Y | 1 | 293 | Y | 1 | 285 | Y | 1 | 369 | Y | 1 | 319 | Y | 1 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 | 388 | Y | 0 | 226 | Y | 1 | 9 |
| Knoxville | 310 | $Y$ | 1 | 427 | $Y$ | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 | 361 | N | 0 | 258 | Y | 1 | 2 |
| Lexington | 385 | $Y$ | 0 | 470 | Y | 0 | 359 | Y | 1 | 436 | Y | 0 | 384 | $Y$ | 0 | 376 | Y | 0 | 460 | Y | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 | 479 | Y | 0 | 347 | Y | 1 | 2 |
| Pittsburgh | 306 | Y | 1 |  | N | 0 | 392 | Y | 0 | 423 | Y | 0 | 417 | Y | 0 | 409 | Y | 0 | 446 | Y | 0 | 443 | Y | 0 | 461 | Y | 0 | 536 | Y | 0 | 511 | Y | 0 | 310 | Y | 1 | 2 |
| Roanoke |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 |  | N | 0 | 237 | Y | 1 |  | N | 0 | 198 | N | 0 |  | N | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 7 | 32 |

[^0]31 = Meets criteria; $0=$ Does not meet criteria

Table A-4: O-D Pairs within the I-81 Corridor Definition

| Origin City \& State |  | Destinations which use I-81 in its shortest time path |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Akron | OH | Scranton |
| Albany | NY | Altoona, Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wikes Barre |
| Alexandria | VA | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Allentown | PA | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Lynchburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Altoona | PA | Albany, Bristol, Danbury, Hartford, Lynchburg, Meriden, New Britain, Roanoke, Schenectady, Scranton, Syracuse, Troy, Utica, Waterbury |
| Annapolis | MD | Roanoke |
| Asheville | NC | Charleston, Roanoke |
| Baltimore | MD | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Bayonne | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Bethesda | MD | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Binghamton | NY | Albany, Alexandria, Allentown, Baltimore, Bayonne, Bethesda, Boston, Brockton, Camden, Chicopee, Columbia, Elizabeth, East Orange, Framingham, Harrisburg, Jersey City, Lancaster, Lawerence, Lowell, Lynn, Manchester, Montreal, Nashua, Newark, Newton, New York, Oshawa, Ottawa, Quincy, Paterson, Philadelphia, Pittsfield, Reading, Schenectady, Scranton, Silver Springs, Springfield, Syracuse, Towson, Trenton, Troy, Union City, Utica, Vineland, Washington, DC, Weymouth, Wilkes Barre, Wilmington, Worcester |
| Boston | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Bridgeport | CT | Harrisburg, Scranton, Syracuse |
| Bristol | CT | Altoona, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Brockton | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Buffalo | NY | Bayonne, Elizabeth, East Orange, Jersey City, Lancaster, Newark, New York, Ottawa, Paterson, Trenton, Union City |
| Camden | NJ | Binghamton, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Canton | OH | Harrisburg, Roanoke, Scranton |
| Charleston | W | Asheville, Charlotte, Durham, Fayetteville, Greensboro, Greenville, High Point, Lynchburg, Raleigh, Richmond, Roanoke, Winston Salem |
| Charlotte | NC | Charleston, Huntington |
| Chattanooga | TN | Roanoke |
| Chicopee | MA | Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Cleveland | OH | Scranton |
| Columbia | MD | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Columbia | SC | Charleston |
| Columbus | OH | Roanoke |
| Danbury | CT | Altoona, Harrisburg, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Durham | NC | Charieston, Huntington |
| East Orange | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Elizabeth | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Erie | PA | Scranton |
| Euclid | OH | Scranton |
| Fall River | MA | Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Fayetteville | NC | Charleston |
| Framingham | MA | Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Greensboro | NC | Charleston, Huntington |
| Greenville | SC | Charleston |
| Harrisburg | PA | Allentown, Albany, Bayonne, Binghamton, Bridgeport, Bristol, Canton, Chicopee, Danbury, East Orange, Elizabeth, Framingham, Hartford, Jersey City, Lynchburg, Meriden New Haven, New Rochelle, New York, Newark, Norwalk, Paterson, Pittsburgh, Pittsfield, Roanoke, Schenectady, Scranton, Springfield, Stamford, Syracuse, Troy, Union City, Utica, Wilkes Barre, Waterbury, Worcester, Yonkers |
| Hartford | CT | Altoona, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| High Point | NC | Charleston, Huntington |
| Huntington | WV | Charlotte, Durham, Greensboro, High Point, Lynchburg, Raleigh, Richmond, Roanoke, Winston Salem |


| Origin City \& State |  | Destinations which use l-81 in its shortest time path |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jersey City | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Knoxville | TN | Lynchburg, Roanoke |
| Lancaster | PA | Binghamton, Buffalo, Roanoke, Rochester, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Lawerence | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Lexington | KY | Roanoke, Winston Salem |
| Lowell | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Lynchburg | VA | Allentown, Altoona, Charleston, Harrisburg, Huntington, Knoxville, Pittsburgh |
| Lynn | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Manchester | NH | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Meriden | CT | Altoona, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Montreal | PQ | Binghamton, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Nashua | NH | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| New Britain | CT | Altoona, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| New Haven | CT | Harrisburg, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| New Rochelle | NY | Harrisburg, Syracuse |
| New York | NY | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Newark | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Newton | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Norwalk | CT | Harrisburg, Scranton, Syracuse |
| Oshawa | ON | Binghamton, Syracuse |
| Ottawa | ON | Binghamton, Buffalo, Rochester, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Paterson | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Pawtucket | RI | Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Philadelphia | PA | Binghamton, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Pittsburgh | PA | Allentown, Bayonne, Elizabeth, Harrisburg, Lynchburg, Newark, Roanoke, Scranton |
| Pittsfield | MA | Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wikes Barre |
| Providence | RI | Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Quincy | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Raleigh | NC | Charleston, Huntington |
| Reading | PA | Binghamton, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Richmond | VA | Charleston, Huntington, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Roanoke | VA | Altoona, Alexandria, Annapolis, Asheville, Baltimore, Bethesda, Canton, Charleston, Chattanooga, Columbus, Columbia(MD), Harrisburg, Huntington, Knoxville, Lancaster, Lexington, Pittsburgh, Reading, Silver Springs, Towson, Washington DC, Wilmington, Youngstown |
| Rochester | NY | Allentown, Bayonne, Camden, East Orange, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Lancaster, Montreal, Newark, New York, Ottawa, Paterson, Philadelphia, Scranton, Trenton, Union City, Vineland |
| Schenectady | NY | Altoona, Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Scranton | PA | Akron, Albany, Alexandria, Altoona, Baltimore, Bethesda, Binghamton, Boston, Bridgeport, Bristol, Brockton, Canton, Chicopee, Cleveland, Columbia, Danbury, Erie, Euclid, Fall River, Framingham, Harrisburg, Hartford, Lancaster, Lawerence, Lowell, Lynn Manchester, Meriden, Nashua, New Britain, New Haven, Newton, Norwalk, Ottawa, Pawtucket, Pittsburgh, Pittsfield, Providence, Quincy, Reading, Richmond, Rochester, Schenectady, Silver Springs, Springfield, Stamford, Syracuse, Towson, Troy, Utica Warwick, Warren, Washington DC, Waterbury, Weymouth, Worcester, Yonkers, Youngstown |
| Silver Springs | MD | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Springfield | MA | Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Stamford | CT | Harrisburg, Scranton, Syracuse |
| Syracuse | NY | Allentown, Altoona, Baltimore, Bayonne, Bethesda, Binghamton, Bridgeport, Camden, Columbia, Danbury, East Orange, Elizabeth, Harrisburg, Jersey City, Lancaster, Montreal Newark, New Haven, New Rochelle, New York, Norwalk, Ottawa, Oshawa, Paterson, Philadelphia, Reading, Scranton, Silver Springs, Stamford, Towson, Trenton, Union City, Vineland, Washington, DC, Wilkes Barre, Wilmington, Yonkers |
| Towson | MD | Binghamton, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Trenton | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse |


| Origin City \& State |  | Destinations which use l-81 in its shortest time path |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Troy | NY | Altoona, Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Union City | NJ | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Utica | NY | Binghamton, Buffalo, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wikes Barre |
| Vineland | NJ | Binghamton, Rochester, Syracuse |
| Warren | OH | Scranton |
| Warwick | RI | Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Washington | DC | Binghamton, Roanoke, Scranton, Syracuse, Wilkes Barre |
| Waterbury | CT | Altoona, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Weymouth | MA | Binghamton, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Wikes Barre | PA | Albany, Alexandria, Baltimore, Bethesda, Binghamton, Boston, Bristol, Brockton, Chicopee,Columbia, Danbury, Fall River, Framingham, Harrisburg, Hartford, Lancaster, Lawerence, Lowell, Lynn, Manchester, Meriden, Nashua, New Britain, New Haven, Newton, Ottawa, Pawtucket, Pittsfield, Providence, Quincy, Reading, Richmond, Schenectady, Silver Springs, Springfield, Syracuse, Towson, Troy, Utica, Warwick, Washington DC, Waterbury, Weymouth, Worcester |
| Wilmington | DE | Binghamton, Syracuse |
| Winston Salem | NC | Charleston, Huntington, Lexington |
| Worchester | MA | Binghamton, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes Barre |
| Yonkers | NY | Harisburg, Scranton, Syracuse |
| Youngstown | OH | Roanoke, Scranton |

Table A-5: Number of Person Trips in 1988 expected to use I-81 (Based on Argonne National Laboratories Data)

|  | City | Total Person Trips (x1000) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Business | Non-Business | Total |
| 1 | New York City | 324 | 2017 | 2341 |
| 2 | Los Angeles | 0 | 34 | 34 |
| 3 | Chicago | 6 | 142 | 148 |
| 4 | Philadelphia | 20 | 153 | 173 |
| 5 | San Francisco | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| 6 | Detroit | 4 | 33 | 37 |
| 7 | Boston | 15 | 402 | 417 |
| 8 | Houston | 2 | 111 | 113 |
| 9 | Dallas | 2 | 131 | 133 |
| 10 | Washington DC | 13 | 126 | 139 |
| 11 | Atlanta | 19 | 179 | 198 |
| 12 | St Louis | 1 | 79 | 80 |
| 13 | Minneapolis | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| 14 | San Diego | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 15 | Pittsburgh | 279 | 1201 | 1480 |
| 16 | Phoenix | 0 | 33 | 33 |
| 17 | Tampa | 6 | 124 | 130 |
| 18 | Seattle | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 19 | Denver | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| 20 | Miami | 9 | 244 | 253 |
| 21 | Salt Lake City | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 22 | Charlotte | 15 | 84 | 99 |
| 23 | Orlando | 9 | 188 | 197 |
| 24 | Las Vegas | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| 25 | Baltimore | 4 | 43 | 47 |
| 26 | Cleveland | 16 | 265 | 281 |
| 27 | Kansas City | 1 | 34 | 35 |
| 28 | El Paso | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 29 | Cincinnati | 10 | 67 | 77 |
| 30 | Milwaukee | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 31 | Sacramento | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 32 | New Orleans | 2 | 62 | 64 |
| 33 | Columbus | 21 | 160 | 181 |
| 34 | Norfolk | 2 | 45 | 47 |
| 35 | San Antonio | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| 36 | Portland | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 37 | Indianapolis | 1 | 19 | 20 |
| 38 | Hartford | 9 | 142 | 151 |
| 39 | Rochester | 59 | 292 | 351 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  | City | Total Person Trips (x1000) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Business | Non-Business | Total |
| 40 | Oklahoma City | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 41 | Buffalo | 63 | 443 | 506 |
| 42 | Memphis | 2 | 29 | 31 |
| 43 | Louisville | 3 | 26 | 29 |
| 44 | Nashville | 6 | 53 | 59 |
| 45 | Greensboro | 16 | 79 | 95 |
| 46 | Jacksonville | 0 | 40 | 40 |
| 47 | Tulsa | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 48 | Austin | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 49 | Syracuse | 123 | 658 | 781 |
| 50 | Tucson | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 51 | Raleigh | 9 | 50 | 59 |
| 52 | Albuquerque | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 53 | Reno | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 54 | Lubbock | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 55 | Midland | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 56 | Omaha | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 57 | Birmingham | 2 | 23 | 25 |
| 58 | Providence | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 59 | Albany | 2 | 43 | 45 |
| 60 | Richmond | 2 | 35 | 37 |
| 61 | Harrisburg | 221 | 712 | 933 |
| 62 | Little Rock | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 63 | Columbia | 2 | 20 | 22 |
| 64 | Chattanooga | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 65 | Jackson | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 66 | Madison | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 67 | Macon | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 68 | Charleston | 4 | 27 | 31 |
| 69 | Savannah | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 70 | Portland | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 71 | Springfield | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 72 | Topeka | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 73 | Davenport | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 74 | Boise | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75 | Billings | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 76 | Sioux Falls | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77 | Casper | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 78 | Grand Forks | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1304 | 8930 | 10234 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table A-6: Origin-Destination Pairs and 1988 Estimates of Person Trips expected to use I-81
(Based on Argonne National Laboratories data)

| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | Business <br> (x1000) | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 55 | Total <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 56 | Distance <br> (mi)1610 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 8 | HST | TX |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 9 | DFW | TX | 1 | 61 | 62 | 1550 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 11 | ATL | GA | 13 | 111 | 124 | 854 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 12 | STL | MO | 1 | 56 | 57 | 976 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 15 | PIT | PA | 43 | 273 | 316 | 379 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 16 | PHX | AZ | 0 | 25 | 25 | 2445 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 22 | CLT | NC | 8 | 40 | 48 | 618 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 27 | KC MCI | MO | 1 | 21 | 22 | 1233 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 28 | ELP | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2150 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 7 | 39 | 46 | 675 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 1 | 26 | 27 | 1335 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 10 | 46 | 56 | 568 |
|  | NYC | NY | 35 | SAT | TX | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1820 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 39 | ROC | NY | 54 | 262 | 316 | 322 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 40 | OKC | OK | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1478 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 41 | BUF | NY | 63 | 368 | 431 | 371 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 42 | MEM | TN | 1 | 10 | 11 | 1102 |
|  | NYC | NY | 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 2 | 14 | 16 | 766 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 2 | 21 | 23 | 900 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 45 | GSO | NC | 8 | 40 | 48 | 528 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 47 | TUL | OK | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1348 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1713 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 49 | SYR | NY | 99 | 457 | 556 | 257 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 50 | TUS | AZ | 0 | 7 | 7 | 2429 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 52 | ABQ | NM | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1997 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1795 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1866 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 57 | BHM | AL | 1 | 8 | 9 | 978 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 5 | 13 | 18 | 191 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1250 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 2 | 12 | 14 | 717 |
| , | NYC | NY | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 3 | 3 | 828 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1224 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 880 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 68 | CRW | W | 1 | 6 | 7 | 546 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 914 |
| 1 | NYC | NY | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1273 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 7 | BOS | MA | 0 | 18 | 18 | 3017 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2685 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1541 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2853 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2598 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2593 |
| 2 | LA | CA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3138 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 7 | BOS | MA | 1 | 76 | 77 | 994 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 1 | 8 | 9 | 865 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 22 | 22 | 908 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 6 | 7 | 708 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 51 | RDU | NC | 2 | 13 | 15 | 784 |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 8 | 8 | 816 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ | Non- <br> Business <br> (x1000) <br> 6 | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Total } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array} \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Distance <br> (mi) <br> 747 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 60 | RIC | VA |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | CHI | IL | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1086 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 8 | HST | TX | 0 | 11 | 11 | 1511 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 9 | DFW | TX | 0 | 11 | 11 | 1443 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 28 | ELP | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2066 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1229 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 35 | SAT | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1737 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 39 | ROC | NY | 5 | 24 | 29 | 314 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 42 | MEM | TN | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1007 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 1 | 7 | 8 | 787 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1599 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 49 | SYR | NY | 13 | 80 | 93 | 249 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1765 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 2 | 2 | 868 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1136 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 714 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1106 |
| 4 | PHL | PA | 68 | CRW | W | 1 | 2 | 3 | 482 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 7 | BOS | MA | 0 | 15 | 15 | 3128 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3001 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3082 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2975 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2845 |
| 5 | SFO | CA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3217 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 22 | CLT | NC | 1 | 6 | 7 | 630 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 1 | 8 | 9 | 728 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 3 | 4 | 592 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 46 | JAX | FL | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1045 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 51 | RDU | NC | 1 | 5 | 6 | 683 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 577 |
| 6 | DTW | MI | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 724 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 8 | HST | TX | 0 | 12 | 12 | 1830 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 9 | DFW | TX | 0 | 14 | 14 | 1753 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 11 | ATL | GA | 2 | 22 | 24 | 1108 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 12 | STL | MO | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1207 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 13 | MSP | MN | 0 | 14 | 14 | 1390 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2984 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 15 | PIT | PA | 3 | 32 | 35 | 574 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 16 | PHX | AZ | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2670 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 18 | SEA | WA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3016 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 19 | DEN | CO | 0 | 12 | 12 | 1998 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 21 | SLC | UT | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2376 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 22 | CLT | NC | 1 | 9 | 10 | 848 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 24 | LAS | NV | 0 | 16 | 16 | 2752 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 26 | CLE | OH | 2 | 37 | 39 | 657 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 27 | KC MCI | MO | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1435 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 28 | ELP | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2384 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 1 | 11 | 12 | 869 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 30 | MKE | WI | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1091 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2992 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1507 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 1 | 7 | 8 | 801 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 35 | SAT | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2018 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 36 | PDX | OR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3144 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 37 | IND | IN | 1 | 6 | 7 | 929 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 40 | OKC | OK | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1694 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array} \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 3 | Total <br> $(\times 1000)$ | Distance <br> (mi) <br> 1341 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 42 | MEM | TN |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 0 | 3 | 3 | 962 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1092 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 4 | 5 | 715 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 47 | TUL | OK | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1535 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1900 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 50 | TUS | AZ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2652 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 52 | ABQ | NM | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2220 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 53 | RNO | NV | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2866 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1982 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2053 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 56 | OMA | NE | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1469 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1226 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 2 | 15 | 17 | 378 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1438 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 955 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1015 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1455 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 66 | MSN | W | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1102 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1067 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 1 | 1 | 751 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1098 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1460 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1114 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2685 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2197 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1508 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1997 |
| 7 | BOS | MA | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1673 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 10 | WAS | DC | 1 | 20 | 21 | 1365 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 25 | BWI | MD | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1404 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1731 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1755 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1768 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1292 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1417 |
| 8 | HST | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1959 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 10 | WAS | DC | 1 | 25 | 26 | 1307 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 25 | BWI | MD | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1357 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1351 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1691 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1703 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1677 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1253 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 61 | HRG MDTT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1365 |
| 9 | DFW | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1881 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 28 | ELP | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1931 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 1 | 12 | 13 | 1099 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 42 | MEM | TN | 1 | 8. | 9 | 854 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 2 | 8 | 10 | 659 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1465 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 49 | SYR | NY | 6 | 34 | 40 | 357 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 50 | TUS | AZ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2244 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1600 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1631 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 57 | BHM | AL | 1 | 5 | 6 | 735 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array} \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$2 | Total <br> $(\times 1000)$ | Distance (mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 62 | LIT | AR |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 580 |
| 10 | WAS | DC | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 2 | 2 | 973 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 15 | PIT | PA | 3 | 15 | 18 | 683 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 1 | 12 | 13 | 959 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 39 | ROC | NY | 0 | 3 | 3 | 922 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 41 | BUF | NY | 0 | 4 | 4 | 907 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 4 | 4 | 922 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1003 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1010 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 688 |
| 11 | ATL | GA | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 1 | 1 | 501 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 903 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1079 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 724 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1108 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1041 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 810 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 766 |
| 12 | STL | MO | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1281 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1232 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1316 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1108 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1225 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1250 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1147 |
| 13 | MSP | MN | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1468 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2682 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2901 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2912 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2852 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2575 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2570 |
| 14 | SDO SAN | CA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3103 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 17 | TPA | FL | 3 | 40 | 43 | 1028 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 20 | MIA | FL | 3 | 72 | 75 | 1180 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 22 | CLT | NC | 3 | 9 | 12 | 495 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 23 | ORL MCO | FL | 3 | 48 | 51 | 976 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1138 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 3 | 14 | 17 | 473 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 5 | 6 | 411 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 46 | JAX | FL | 0 | 12 | 12 | 829 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 51 | RDU | NC | 2 | 5 | 7 | 508 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 3 | 3 | 788 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 59 | ALB | NY | 1 | 7 | 8 | 453 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 211 | 656 | 867 | 197 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 589 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 590 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 697 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 669 |
| 15 | PIT | PA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 2 | 2 | 690 |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2349 |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2570 |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2493 |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2233 |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2228 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array}$ | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Total } \\ & (\times 1000) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Distance } \\ & \text { (mi) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | PHX | AZ | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2750 |
| 17 | TPA | FL | 26 | CLE | OH | 3 | 48 | 51 | 1108 |
| 17 | TPA | FL | 41 | BUF | NY | 0 | 20 | 20 | 1293 |
| 17 | TPA | FL | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 12 | 12 | 1237 |
| 17 | TPA | FL | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 4 | 4 | 857 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2887 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2948 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2714 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2836 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | , | 1 | 2846 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2753 |
| 18 | SEA | WA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3090 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1766 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1997 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1581 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1715 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1667 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1589 |
| 19 | DEN | CO | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2072 |
| 20 | MIA | FL | 26 | CLE | OH | 3 | 80 | 83 | 1252 |
| 20 | MIA | FL | 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 3 | 36 | 39 | 1171 |
| 20 | MIA | FL | 41 | BUF | NY | 0 | 28 | 28 | 1400 |
| 20 | MIA | FL | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 24 | 24 | 1386 |
| 20 | MIA | FL | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1008 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 26 | CLE | OH | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1762 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2223 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | , | 1 | 2269 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2040 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2214 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2245 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2100 |
| 21 | SLC | UT | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2509 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 26 | CLE | OH | 1 | 7 | 8 | 516 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 1 | 4 | 5 | 435 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 741 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 39 | ROC | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 693 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 41 | BUF | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 707 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 690 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 |  | 1 | 768 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 59 | ALB | NY | 0. | 1 | 1 | 772 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 456 |
| 22 | CLT | NC | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 957 |
| 23 | ORL MCO | FL | 26 | CLE | OH | 3 | 60 | 63 | 1046 |
| 23 | ORL MCO | FL | 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 3 | 44 | 47 | 960 |
| 23 | ORL. MCO | FL | 41 | BUF | NY | 0 | 16 | 16 | 1204 |
| 23 | ORL MCO | FL | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 16 | 16 | 1185 |
| 23 | ORL MCO | FL | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 4 | 4 | 802 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2478 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2659 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2634 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2376 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2336 |
| 24 | LAS | NV | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2860 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 32 | NO MSY | LA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1135 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 35 | SAT | TX | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1632 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 42 | MEM | TN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 911 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Non- Business (x1000) | Total <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 4 | Distance <br> (mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 44 | NSH BNA | TN |  | 3 |  |  |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1503 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 49 | SYR | NY | 3 | 14 | 17 | 321 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1669 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 2 | 2 | 771 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1042 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 618 |
| 25 | BWI | MD | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1012 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 1 | 10 | 11 | 558 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 491 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 46 | JAX | FL | 0 | 8 | 8 | 909 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 51 | RDU | NC | 1 | 4 | 5 | 561 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 59 | ALB | NY | 1 | 5 | 6 | 484 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 610 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 739 |
| 26 | CLE | OH | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 729 |
| 27 | KC MCl | MO | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1160 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1336 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 977 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1087 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1358 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1298 |
| 27 | KC MCI | MO | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1063 |
| 27 | KC MCl | MO | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1016 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1953 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2293 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2279 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2220 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1870 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1937 |
| 28 | ELP | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2462 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 613 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 4 | 4 | 769 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 449 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 51 | RDU | NC | 1 | 3 | 4 | 520 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 810 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 746 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 509 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 468 |
| 29 | CIN CVG | OH | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 978 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 952 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 2 | 2 | 995 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 794 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 933 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 927 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 833 |
| 30 | MKE | WI | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1164 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2842 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2909 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2692 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2763 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2829 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2752 |
| 31 | SMT SMF | CA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3060 |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1427 |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1353 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array}$ | Non- Business $(\times 1000)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Total } \\ & (\times 1000) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Distance } \\ & \text { (mi) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1443 |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1119 |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 905 |
| 32 | NO MSY | LA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1642 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 563 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 1 | 3 | 4 | 660 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 409 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 46 | JAX | FL | 0 | 4 | 4 | 825 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 51 | RDU | NC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 512 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 704 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 637 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 449 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 1 | 3 | 4 | 362 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 529 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 657 |
| 33 | CMS CMH | OH | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 869 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 36 | PDX | OR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2968 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 37 | IND | IN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 705 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 40 | OKC | OK | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1365 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 42 | MEM | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 881 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 647 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 672 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 47 | TUL | OK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1264 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 49 | SYR | NY | 1 | 3 | 4 | 502 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 50 | TUS | AZ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2263 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 52 | ABQ | NM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1888 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 53 | RNO | NV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2793 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1615 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1640 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 56 | OMA | NE | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1318 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1023 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 973 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 1 | 1 | 405 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 891 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1219 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 984 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2522 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2078 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1379 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1868 |
| 34 | NFK ORF | VA | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1544 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1911 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1942 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1970 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1481 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1604 |
| 35 | SAT | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2125 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2998 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2757 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2916 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2920 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2817 |
| 36 | PDX | OR | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3216 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 0 | 3 | 3 | 835 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 551 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | Business (x1000) | Non- Business $(\times 1000)$ | Total$(\times 1000)$ | Distance <br> (mi) <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 |  | IN | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| 37 | IND | IN | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 874 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 807 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 610 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 532 |
| 37 | IND | IN | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1051 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 40 | OKC | OK | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1640 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 42 | MEM | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1200 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 873 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1001 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 618 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 47 | TUL. | OK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1438 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 48 | AUS | TX | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1803 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 50 | TUS | AZ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2503 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 51 | RDU | NC | 1 | 3 | 4 | 620 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 52 | ABQ | NM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2102 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 53 | RNO | NV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2798 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1885 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 55 | MID MAF | TX | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1956 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 56 | OMA | NE | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1370 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1082 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 1 | 3 | 4 | 281 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1340 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 812 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 918 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1348 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1019 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 970 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 684 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1004 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1363 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1031 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2611 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2098 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1425 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1914 |
| 38 | HTF BDL | CT | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1590 |
| 39 | ROC | NY | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 604 |
| 39 | ROC | NY | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1103 |
| 39 | ROC | NY | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 727 |
| 39 | ROC | NY | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 956 |
| 40 | OKC | OK | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1499 |
| 40 | OKC | OK | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1262 |
| 40 | OKC | OK | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1260 |
| 40 | OKC | OK | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1736 |
| 41 | BUF | NY | 45 | GSO | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 580 |
| 41 | BUF | NY | 46 | JAX | FL | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1094 |
| 41 | BUF | NY | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 801 |
| 41 | BUF | NY | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 906 |
| 41 | BUF | NY | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 878 |
| 42 | MEM | TN | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1251 |
| 42 | MEM | TN | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1231 |
| 42 | MEM | TN | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 801 |
| 42 | MEM | TN | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 913 |
| 42 | MEM | TN | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1462 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 45 | GSO | NC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 466 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Business } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array}$ | NonBusiness | Total $(\times 1000)$ | Distance (mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 1 | 1 | 604 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 911 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 858 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 552 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 569 |
| 43 | LUI SDF | KY | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1095 |
| 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1045 |
| 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1034 |
| 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 595 |
| 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 707 |
| 44 | NSH BNA | TN | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1201 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 1 | 1 | 601 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 56 | OMA | NE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1130 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 679 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 639 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 367 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 846 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 68 | CRW | WV | 1 | 0 | 1 | 247 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 815 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 742 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1043 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 848 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2336 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1910 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1252 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1737 |
| 45 | GSO | NC | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1417 |
| 46 | JAX | FL | 49 | SYR | NY | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1047 |
| 46 | JAX | FL | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 658 |
| 47 | TUL | OK | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1499 |
| 47 | TUL | OK | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1386 |
| 47 | TUL | OK | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1198 |
| 47 | TUL | OK | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1157 |
| 47 | TUL | OK | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1617 |
| 48 | AUS | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1864 |
| 48 | AUS | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1792 |
| 48 | AUS | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1414 |
| 48 | AUS | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1526 |
| 48 | AUS | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2000 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 51 | RDU | NC | 0 | 2 | 2 | 605 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 57 | BHM | AL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1013 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 459 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 1 | 4 | 5 | 244 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 777 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 875 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1238 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0. | 0 | 953 |
| 49 | SYR | NY | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 910 |
| 50 | TUS | AZ | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2538 |
| 50 | TUS | AZ | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2473 |
| 50 | TUS | AZ | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2168 |
| 50 | TUS | AZ | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2196 |
| 50 | TUS | AZ | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2736 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 56 | OMA | NE | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1294 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 917 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 1 | 1 | 345 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | Business <br> (x1000) <br> 0 | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 0 | Total <br> $(x 1000)$ | Distance <br> (mi) <br> 813 <br> 1114 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 71 | SPI | IL |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1114 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 919 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2482 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2066 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1323 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1808 |
| 51 | RDU | NC | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1488 |
| 52 | ABQ | NM | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2141 |
| 52 | ABQ | NM | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2041 |
| 52 | ABQ | NM | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1804 |
| 52 | ABQ | NM | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1799 |
| 52 | ABQ | NM | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2304 |
| 53 | RNO | NV | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2763 |
| 53 | RNO | NV | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2619 |
| 53 | RNO | NV | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2968 |
| 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1946 |
| 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1833 |
| 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1549 |
| 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1604 |
| 54 | LBK LBB | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2064 |
| 55 | MID MAF | TX | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2017 |
| 55 | MID MAF | TX | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1904 |
| 55 | MID MAF | TX | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1580 |
| 55 | MID MAF | TX | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 |
| 55 | MID MAF | TX | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2135 |
| 56 | OMA | NE | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1310 |
| 56 | OMA | NE | 60 | RIC | VA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1189 |
| 56 | OMA | NE | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1529 |
| 57 | BHM | AL | 58 | PVD | RI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1117 |
| 57 | BHM | AL | 59 | ALB | NY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1071 |
| 57 | BHM | AL | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 779 |
| 57 | BHM | AL | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 561 |
| 57 | BHM | AL | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1343 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 342 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1387 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 849 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 979 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1353 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1031 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 700 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1065 |
| 58 | PVD | RI | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1424 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 0 | 2 | 2 | 273 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1357 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 822 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 914 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1349 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 66 | MSN | W1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 939 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 636 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 935 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1303 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 951 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2518 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2098 |


| Origin |  |  | Destination |  |  | Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ <br> 0 | Non- <br> Business <br> $(\times 1000)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Total } \\ (\times 1000) \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Distance (mi)$1345$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 76 | FSD | SD |  |  |  |  |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1834 |
| 59 | ALB | NY | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1510 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 937 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 1 | 1 | 529 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 66 | MSN | WI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 885 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 68 | CRW | W | 1 | 2 | 3 | 305 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 801 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1129 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 896 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2396 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1949 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1291 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1780 |
| 60 | RIC | VA | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1456 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 62 | LIT | AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1049 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 543 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 64 | CHA | TN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 641 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 65 | JAN | MS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1015 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 67 | MCN | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 719 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 68 | CRW | WV | 0 | 1 | 1 | 358 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 723 |
| 61 | HRG MDT | PA | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1082 |
| 62 | LIT | AR | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1600 |
| 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 362 |
| 63 | CBA CAE | SC | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1043 |
| 64 | CHA | TN | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 |
| 64 | CHA | TN | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1115 |
| 65 | JAN | MS | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1587 |
| 66 | MSN | WI | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1170 |
| 67 | MCN | GA | 68 | CRW | W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 523 |
| 67 | MCN | GA | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1167 |
| 68 | CRW | WV | 69 | SAV | GA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 495 |
| 68 | CRW | WV | 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 882 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 71 | SPI | IL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1166 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 72 | TPK | KS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1534 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 73 | QDC | IA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1182 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 74 | BOI | ID | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2793 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 75 | BIL | MT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2266 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 76 | FSD | SD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1576 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 77 | CSP | WY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2065 |
| 70 | PDM PWM | ME | 78 | GFK | ND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1741 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 652 | 4465 | 5117 | 814824 |


[^0]:    1 Shortest Time Path between Origin and Destination from Automap (Miles)
    $2 \mathrm{Y}=$ Uses I-81; $\mathrm{N}=$ Does not use I-81

