



**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES** *PEOPLE'S VIEWS AND PRACTICES*

EMBARGO: 11:30AM (CANBERRA TIME) WED 29 NOV 2000

**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>page</i>
Notes .....	2
 CHAPTERS	
<b>1</b> Household waste management .....	3
<b>2</b> Habits of motor vehicle owners .....	18
<b>3</b> Use of transport .....	26
 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	
Explanatory notes .....	42
Technical notes .....	44

- For further information about these and related statistics, contact Bob Harrison on 02 6252 7369 or the National Information Service on 1300 135 070.

## NOTES

**ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION** This publication is the sixth of its type and provides data on environmental behaviour and practices of Australian households and individuals collected in 2000. Respondents were aged 18 years or older. The topics covered include household waste management such as recycling and hazardous waste, motor vehicle ownership and maintenance, and use of private and public transport.



**ABOUT THE SURVEY** The data in this publication are derived from a supplement to the Monthly Population Survey. Please refer to the Explanatory Notes at the back of this publication for further details about this survey.



**DATA COMPARABILITY** A set of changing topics rotate over a period of three years. The topics contained in this publication compare with data collected in March and April 1996. Where applicable those data have been included in this publication for comparison purposes.



**SYMBOLS AND OTHER USAGES**

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
RSE	Relative standard error
SE	Standard error
*	subject to sampling variability too high for most practical purposes (i.e. relative standard error greater than 25%)
—	nil or rounded to zero (including null cells)
..	not applicable



**ROUNDING** Where figures have been rounded, discrepancies may occur between sums of the component items and totals. Published percentages are calculated prior to rounding of the figures and therefore some discrepancy may occur between these percentages and those that could be calculated from the rounded figures.

R.W. Edwards  
Acting Australian Statistician

## MAIN FINDINGS

Households generate a lot of wastes, some of which are hazardous in nature. Recycling of common household waste and the proper disposal of hazardous household waste are important for environmental protection. Recycling conserves resources, reduces environmental pollution and reduces the volume of garbage going to landfill. The proper handling and disposal of hazardous waste, prevents toxic materials from leaching into the environment. Incorrect disposal potentially has severe consequences such as health issues and costly environmental remediation.

- In March 2000, the most common items recycled by Australian households were paper (85%), old clothing or rags and plastic bags (both about 83%), glass (82%), plastic bottles (81%) and cans (75%). Since the first ABS survey in 1992, recycling activity has increased as more households have become involved. For example, recycling of paper has increased from 55% of households in 1992 to 85% in 2000.
- Less than 7% of Australian households recycled all the items surveyed, with the Australian Capital Territory registering the highest percentage (12%). The lack of recyclable materials was the primary reason reported for not recycling all surveyed items (73%), with one person households recording the highest proportion (78%).
- About 3% of Australian households did not participate in any recycling, with the highest proportion recorded in the Northern Territory (9%). Non-participation in recycling has declined markedly over the years (1992, 15%; 1996, 9%; 2000, 3%).
- The preferred method for household recycling of paper (87%), glass (88%), cans and plastic bottles (both 89%) in Australia was a collection service from the dwelling.
- The two main recycling methods used by Australian households were a collection service from the dwelling and re-use within the household (both around 83%).
- Around two-thirds of Australian households composted or mulched their kitchen or food waste (67%) and garden waste (71%).
- Most Australian households recycled most materials mainly on a fortnightly basis: paper (56%), glass (53%), cans (52%), plastic bottles (52%) and garden waste (39%). Kitchen or food waste (85%) was recycled weekly.
- Just over a third (37%) of Australian households knew of services or facilities that were available in their area for the safe disposal of household hazardous waste. More households disposed of their hazardous waste via the usual garbage collection service from the dwelling than before (1996, 62%; 2000, 85%).
- More households abandoned the practice of taking their household hazardous waste to the dump or a central collection point (1996, 30%; 2000, 21%). Although households were more aware of the availability of facilities in their area for the safe disposal of household hazardous waste (1996, 31%; 2000, 37%), this has not translated into practice.

## ITEMS RECYCLED

In March 2000, Australian households recycled paper more than any other material (85%). This was closely followed by old clothing/rags and plastic bags (both about 83%), glass (82%), plastic bottles (81%) and cans (75%). These remained the most common items recycled by Australian households. Since the first ABS survey in 1992, results indicate an increase in recycling activity, as more households became involved.

The proportion of Australian households recycling all items surveyed has remained relatively unchanged at around 6% since 1996. Despite a drop from 16% in 1996 to 12% in 2000, the Australian Capital Territory continued to be the leading State for recycling all items. Queensland and Tasmania (both 7%) had the next highest rates, while Western Australia had the lowest (4%).

The Australian Capital Territory also had the lowest non-participation rate (0.5%) in March 2000, with the Northern Territory recording the highest proportion of households not involved in any recycling (9%). Generally the proportion of households not participating in recycling has declined markedly over the years (1992, 15%; 1996, 9%; 2000, 3%).

## 1.1 HOUSEHOLDS INVOLVED IN RECYCLING: ITEMS RECYCLED BY STATE (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Paper	2 132.2	1 588.8	1 129.4	479.6	541.1	149.9	39.5	118.6	6 179.1
Glass	2 003.7	1 612.0	1 118.4	487.5	483.3	143.8	32.5	117.4	5 998.6
Cans	1 694.3	1 512.1	1 047.9	480.1	440.2	125.8	28.4	108.1	5 436.9
Plastic bottles	1 951.8	1 595.7	1 128.4	509.1	462.9	136.7	33.8	117.1	5 935.7
Plastic bags	1 939.2	1 512.2	1 168.8	505.0	592.5	155.5	42.3	110.2	6 025.7
Kitchen or food waste	1 106.4	1 003.5	685.4	321.1	322.0	113.0	26.0	73.0	3 650.4
Garden waste	1 399.3	1 148.3	852.3	375.2	398.2	119.3	29.0	85.4	4 407.0
Old clothing or rags	1 977.9	1 521.9	1 170.4	505.5	595.5	163.0	45.4	105.8	6 085.5
No recycling	98.7	25.3	31.6	19.6	41.0	8.9	5.0	*0.7	230.7
All items recycled	164.1	116.9	101.3	36.7	31.5	13.5	3.6	14.7	482.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 437.5</b>	<b>1 783.6</b>	<b>1 365.1</b>	<b>614.1</b>	<b>726.8</b>	<b>188.1</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>120.9</b>	<b>7 292.6</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Paper	87.5	89.1	82.7	78.1	74.5	79.7	69.8	98.1	84.7
Glass	82.2	90.4	81.9	79.4	66.5	76.4	57.3	97.1	82.3
Cans	69.5	84.8	76.8	78.2	60.6	66.9	50.1	89.4	74.6
Plastic bottles	80.1	89.5	82.7	82.9	63.7	72.7	59.8	96.9	81.4
Plastic bags	79.6	84.8	85.6	82.2	81.5	82.7	74.7	91.2	82.6
Kitchen or food waste	45.4	56.3	50.2	52.3	44.3	60.1	45.8	60.4	50.1
Garden waste	57.4	64.4	62.4	61.1	54.8	63.4	51.3	70.6	60.4
Old clothing or rags	81.1	85.3	85.7	82.3	81.9	86.6	80.2	87.5	83.4
No recycling	4.1	1.4	2.3	3.2	5.6	4.7	8.8	*0.5	3.2
All items recycled	6.7	6.6	7.4	6.0	4.3	7.2	6.4	12.2	6.6
MARCH 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Paper	78.1	76.8	71.3	70.2	67.7	63.1	39.1	98.4	74.5
Glass	74.0	74.9	76.8	74.9	60.5	68.3	30.4	96.4	73.4
Cans	57.2	61.8	70.2	70.5	58.2	53.3	26.2	88.5	62.1
Plastic	63.6	67.8	75.8	68.4	55.3	62.8	39.9	93.5	66.8
Kitchen/food waste	41.0	46.9	46.4	47.2	41.5	55.8	43.7	64.7	44.9
Garden waste	48.1	52.5	53.9	51.9	44.6	55.0	51.6	70.6	50.8
Old clothing/rags	66.2	67.4	67.4	63.7	65.2	66.7	60.8	77.1	66.6
No recycling	10.1	8.7	7.9	8.2	12.6	10.0	20.4	*1.0	9.4
All items recycled	6.1	5.7	7.0	5.0	5.9	5.1	*0.8	15.8	6.2

1.1 HOUSEHOLDS INVOLVED IN RECYCLING: ITEMS RECYCLED BY STATE (a) *continued*

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MAY 1992									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Paper	57.5	67.1	37.2	43.4	59.5	38.4	26.7	64.0	54.7
Glass	51.3	70.0	43.3	56.1	56.9	47.2	15.0	55.6	55.3
Cans	39.5	53.7	34.3	52.4	54.2	26.0	20.8	28.7	44.1
Plastic	33.6	47.9	34.6	33.4	35.1	30.2	14.3	33.2	37.3
Kitchen or food waste	30.1	40.6	34.2	39.5	36.7	46.4	37.4	41.2	35.6
Garden waste	41.3	52.1	51.1	47.9	45.7	53.6	49.5	52.9	47.3
Old clothing or rags	58.9	66.8	62.9	62.9	69.3	63.7	52.3	73.7	63.3
No recycling	17.6	10.5	18.1	16.0	12.7	19.0	27.6	12.1	15.3

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one item may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

Recycling rates for the items surveyed have increased since 1996 across all household types, but one person households continued to be below those of the other household types, particularly for kitchen, food and garden waste. One person households also recorded the lowest participation rate of recycling all items, although the percentage has decreased from 16% in 1996 to about 7% in 2000. Households with all members over 15 years (9%) have replaced couple with dependent child(ren) as the household type most likely to recycle all items in March 2000, and also showed a strong tendency to recycle.

## 1.2 HOUSEHOLDS INVOLVED IN RECYCLING: ITEMS RECYCLED BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (a)

	One person	Couple only	Households with all members over 15	Couple, dependent child(ren)	One parent, dependent child(ren)	All other households	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARCH 2000							
Paper	79.8	86.5	88.2	87.2	81.3	84.3	84.7
Glass	75.8	85.0	86.5	84.2	78.9	83.1	82.3
Cans	65.0	77.8	79.6	78.4	72.3	76.1	74.6
Plastic bottles	72.2	83.2	86.1	85.8	81.4	83.6	81.4
Plastic bags	75.0	84.6	83.9	87.3	86.2	83.3	82.6
Kitchen or food waste	37.8	55.6	54.4	56.8	54.0	44.6	50.1
Garden waste	43.8	68.1	70.1	68.7	58.1	53.1	60.4
Old clothing or rags	73.1	86.3	88.6	90.3	87.3	78.3	83.4
No recycling	6.5	1.7	2.1	1.3	4.6	3.3	3.2
All items recycled	2.8	7.4	9.1	8.7	3.8	7.3	6.6
MARCH 1996							
Paper	68.8	76.9	77.6	77.6	68.2	72.1	74.5
Glass	65.6	77.1	77.9	77.4	67.4	68.8	73.4
Cans	50.8	65.3	66.9	68.6	58.0	58.6	62.1
Plastic	55.8	68.9	69.4	73.9	65.6	65.0	66.8
Kitchen or food waste	32.1	51.2	48.3	52.0	40.6	37.1	44.9
Garden waste	34.7	60.4	56.2	58.9	41.0	40.1	50.8
Old clothing or rags	51.5	70.4	70.4	77.0	70.4	57.9	66.6
No recycling	16.3	6.3	8.3	5.4	11.6	11.6	9.4
All items recycled	2.1	7.5	8.2	8.6	3.3	4.3	6.2

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one item may be specified.

## RECYCLING METHOD

In March 2000, the preferred method for household recycling of paper (87%), glass (88%), cans and plastic bottles (both 89%) in Australia was a collection service from the dwelling. Collection from dwellings for these items was highest in the Australian Capital Territory. For plastic bags, re-using them was the most popular option, with households in the Northern Territory being the main user of this option (95%). Around two thirds of Australian households composted or mulched their kitchen or food waste (67%) and garden waste (71%). Households in the Australian Capital Territory were most likely to compost or mulch their kitchen or food waste (84%), while Northern Territory households were the most likely to compost or mulch their garden waste (86%). Old clothes or rags (73%) were usually taken to a central collection point other than the dump (such as a charity depot), although 40% of Australian households also re-used them.

## 1.3 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Items Recycled By Method, March 2000

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
PAPER ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	62.0	55.3	32.2	29.3	32.0	5.2	*1.4	6.3	223.7
Collected from the house	1 928.2	1 438.6	948.2	385.6	427.3	98.1	24.5	113.5	5 364.2
Took it to a special area at the dump	34.9	25.0	*8.9	8.5	*5.4	16.0	*0.5	*1.5	100.8
Used as compost or mulch	84.8	79.8	105.2	23.7	46.0	22.1	7.3	5.7	374.7
Re-used it	281.1	204.3	259.1	94.4	112.8	42.6	16.5	17.1	1 027.9
Other	18.9	25.8	19.2	10.6	10.9	*2.9	*0.8	*0.6	89.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 132.2</b>	<b>1 588.8</b>	<b>1 129.4</b>	<b>479.6</b>	<b>541.1</b>	<b>149.9</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>118.6</b>	<b>6 179.1</b>
GLASS ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	68.9	26.2	29.2	100.5	15.3	7.3	*0.5	5.1	253.0
Collected from the house	1 823.0	1 505.0	980.5	342.3	394.3	97.1	23.5	112.1	5 277.7
Took it to a special area at the dump	39.4	19.2	20.2	11.1	*6.3	21.4	*1.4	*0.4	119.4
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	238.9	187.2	244.6	90.8	123.0	41.3	12.3	14.8	952.9
Other	*8.2	*9.6	*8.0	7.8	*3.4	*1.1	*0.3	*0.2	38.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 003.7</b>	<b>1 612.0</b>	<b>1 118.4</b>	<b>487.5</b>	<b>483.3</b>	<b>143.8</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>117.4</b>	<b>5 998.6</b>
CANS ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	85.6	46.0	49.7	169.7	65.3	6.1	3.2	*2.8	428.4
Collected from the house	1 560.4	1 433.9	970.5	307.6	362.2	95.2	24.2	106.5	4 860.6
Took it to a special area at the dump	27.2	16.6	14.6	11.4	*4.5	21.2	*0.5	*0.4	96.4
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	24.9	14.8	36.3	8.9	9.2	*4.0	*2.1	*2.7	102.9
Other	16.9	17.1	*8.5	7.6	7.2	*2.3	*0.3	—	59.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 694.3</b>	<b>1 512.1</b>	<b>1 047.9</b>	<b>480.1</b>	<b>440.2</b>	<b>125.8</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>108.1</b>	<b>5 436.9</b>
PLASTIC BOTTLES ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	55.5	27.0	15.2	164.4	13.6	6.1	—	4.3	286.1
Collected from the house	1 801.4	1 511.1	1 028.1	338.2	381.0	100.0	24.7	111.8	5 296.3
Took it to a special area at the dump	34.9	20.6	12.9	11.9	*4.5	21.1	*0.7	*0.6	107.2
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	126.1	83.4	185.0	35.1	92.9	16.1	11.5	10.1	560.1
Other	*8.2	*9.9	*3.0	8.5	*5.2	*0.7	*0.3	—	35.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 951.8</b>	<b>1 595.7</b>	<b>1 128.4</b>	<b>509.1</b>	<b>462.9</b>	<b>136.7</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>117.1</b>	<b>5 935.7</b>

1.3 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Items Recycled By Method, March 2000 *continued*

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
PLASTIC BAGS ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	219.2	190.6	87.8	69.4	38.4	18.9	*2.5	15.2	642.1
Collected from the house	199.0	123.2	84.6	40.0	43.3	*2.1	*0.7	9.4	502.3
Took it to a special area at the dump	*8.8	*5.8	*1.9	*1.6	*1.5	*1.4	—	*0.2	21.2
Used it as a compost or mulch	*7.5	*2.4	*1.7	*1.7	*1.1	*0.4	—	—	14.7
Re-used it	1 656.3	1 338.0	1 069.0	423.2	538.7	141.0	40.3	94.6	5 301.2
Other	40.9	34.2	15.4	11.1	8.0	*3.6	*0.3	*1.4	114.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 939.2</b>	<b>1 512.2</b>	<b>1 168.8</b>	<b>505.0</b>	<b>592.5</b>	<b>155.5</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>110.2</b>	<b>6 025.7</b>
KITCHEN/FOOD WASTE ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	*1.5	*1.9	*2.1	*0.7	*0.5	*0.2	—	*0.2	*7.1
Collected from the house	190.3	148.9	55.8	32.3	8.2	*1.1	*0.8	8.4	445.8
Took it to a special area at the dump	*0.8	*0.6	*1.0	*0.3	*0.4	*0.8	—	*0.2	*4.1
Used it as a compost or mulch	712.5	676.5	457.9	215.2	206.9	83.6	18.9	61.5	2 433.0
Re-used it	184.2	173.5	151.6	63.9	86.1	28.8	6.0	4.5	698.6
Other	90.5	103.8	73.2	31.1	45.9	11.6	3.2	*1.8	361.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 106.4</b>	<b>1 003.5</b>	<b>685.4</b>	<b>321.1</b>	<b>322.0</b>	<b>113.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>3 650.4</b>
GARDEN WASTE ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	18.3	24.0	*10.0	*3.3	*2.9	*1.8	—	*3.4	63.7
Collected from the house	487.5	330.0	85.0	126.9	87.7	9.6	—	12.8	1 139.5
Took it to a special area at the dump	58.7	80.0	65.1	13.2	19.7	14.4	4.6	16.2	272.0
Used it as a compost or mulch	904.2	770.4	719.5	248.6	291.9	95.1	25.0	59.2	3 113.9
Re-used it	58.2	53.6	28.4	16.8	24.0	6.0	*0.8	*2.2	189.9
Other	18.1	31.9	17.0	7.3	12.6	4.7	*0.3	*1.0	92.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 399.3</b>	<b>1 148.3</b>	<b>852.3</b>	<b>375.2</b>	<b>398.2</b>	<b>119.3</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>4 407.0</b>
OLD CLOTHING/RAGS ('000)									
Central collection point other than dump	1 500.1	1 070.6	818.9	350.9	450.1	122.9	33.6	87.5	4 434.5
Collected from the house	69.6	238.0	51.1	12.4	17.5	5.4	*0.5	*1.9	396.5
Took it to a special area at the dump	28.2	*10.3	*3.2	*1.4	*1.9	*1.3	—	*0.5	46.8
Used it as a compost or mulch	18.2	*11.2	12.8	*2.4	*4.4	*1.4	*0.2	*0.2	50.7
Re-used it	713.9	531.9	572.7	237.9	265.4	62.8	22.9	31.7	2 439.2
Other	88.4	79.2	39.2	26.8	18.0	5.1	*1.2	4.2	262.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 977.9</b>	<b>1 521.9</b>	<b>1 170.4</b>	<b>505.5</b>	<b>595.5</b>	<b>163.0</b>	<b>45.4</b>	<b>105.8</b>	<b>6 085.5</b>

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

1.3 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Items Recycled By Method, March 2000 *continued*

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
PAPER (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	2.9	3.5	2.9	6.1	5.9	3.5	*3.5	5.3	3.6
Collected from the house	90.4	90.6	84.0	80.4	79.0	65.5	62.0	95.7	86.8
Took it to a special area at the dump	1.6	1.6	*0.8	1.8	*1.0	10.7	*1.3	*1.3	1.6
Used it as a compost or mulch	4.0	5.0	9.3	4.9	8.5	14.7	18.5	4.8	6.1
Re-used it	13.2	12.9	22.9	19.7	20.8	28.4	41.7	14.4	16.6
Other	0.9	1.6	1.7	2.2	2.0	*2.0	*2.0	*0.5	1.5
GLASS (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	3.4	1.6	2.6	20.6	3.2	5.1	*1.7	4.3	4.2
Collected from the house	91.0	93.4	87.7	70.2	81.6	67.5	72.5	95.5	88.0
Took it to a special area at the dump	2.0	1.2	1.8	2.3	*1.3	14.9	*4.3	*0.3	2.0
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	11.9	11.6	21.9	18.6	25.4	28.7	37.8	12.6	15.9
Other	*0.4	*0.6	*0.7	1.6	*0.7	*0.8	*0.9	*0.2	0.6
CANS (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	5.1	3.0	4.7	35.3	14.8	4.8	11.2	*2.6	7.9
Collected from the house	92.1	94.8	92.6	64.1	82.3	75.7	85.4	98.5	89.4
Took it to a special area at the dump	1.6	1.1	1.4	2.4	*1.0	16.8	*1.8	*0.3	1.8
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	1.5	1.0	3.5	1.9	2.1	*3.2	*7.3	*2.5	1.9
Other	1.0	1.1	*0.8	1.6	1.6	*1.8	*1.0	—	1.1
PLASTIC BOTTLES (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	2.8	1.7	1.3	32.3	2.9	4.4	—	3.7	4.8
Collected from the house	92.3	94.7	91.1	66.4	82.3	73.2	73.0	95.5	89.2
Took it to a special area at the dump	1.8	1.3	1.1	2.3	*1.0	15.4	*2.0	*0.5	1.8
Used it as a compost or mulch	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Re-used it	6.5	5.2	16.4	6.9	20.1	11.7	34.0	8.7	9.4
Other	*0.4	*0.6	*0.3	1.7	*1.1	*0.5	*0.9	—	0.6
PLASTIC BAGS (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	11.3	12.6	7.5	13.7	6.5	12.2	*5.8	13.8	10.7
Collected from the house	10.3	8.1	7.2	7.9	7.3	*1.3	*1.6	8.5	8.3
Took it to a special area at the dump	*0.5	*0.4	*0.2	*0.3	*0.3	*0.9	—	*0.2	0.4
Used it as a compost or mulch	*0.4	*0.2	*0.1	*0.3	*0.2	*0.3	—	—	0.2
Re-used it	85.4	88.5	91.5	83.8	90.9	90.7	95.4	85.8	88.0
Other	2.1	2.3	1.3	2.2	1.3	*2.3	*0.6	*1.3	1.9
KITCHEN/FOOD WASTE (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	*0.1	*0.2	*0.3	*0.2	*0.1	*0.2	—	*0.3	*0.2
Collected from the house	17.2	14.8	8.1	10.1	2.5	*1.0	*3.0	11.5	12.2
Took it to a special area at the dump	*0.1	*0.1	*0.2	*0.1	*0.1	*0.7	—	*0.3	*0.1
Used it as a compost or mulch	64.4	67.4	66.8	67.0	64.3	74.0	72.8	84.2	66.7
Re-used it	16.6	17.3	22.1	19.9	26.7	25.5	23.0	6.2	19.1
Other	8.2	10.3	10.7	9.7	14.3	10.3	12.4	*2.4	9.9



### 1.3 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Items Recycled By Method, March 2000 *continued*

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
GARDEN WASTE (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	1.3	2.1	*1.2	*0.9	*0.7	*1.5	—	*4.0	1.4
Collected from the house	34.8	28.7	10.0	33.8	22.0	8.1	—	15.0	25.9
Took it to a special area at the dump	4.2	7.0	7.6	3.5	5.0	12.1	15.8	19.0	6.2
Used it as a compost or mulch	64.6	67.1	84.4	66.2	73.3	79.7	86.1	69.4	70.7
Re-used it	4.2	4.7	3.3	4.5	6.0	5.0	*2.7	*2.6	4.3
Other	1.3	2.8	2.0	2.0	3.2	3.9	*0.9	*1.2	2.1
OLD CLOTHING/RAGS (%)									
Central collection point other than dump	75.8	70.3	70.0	69.4	75.6	75.4	74.1	82.7	72.9
Collected from the house	3.5	15.6	4.4	2.4	2.9	3.3	*1.1	*1.8	6.5
Took it to a special area at the dump	1.4	*0.7	*0.3	*0.3	*0.3	*0.8	—	*0.4	0.8
Used it as a compost or mulch	0.9	*0.7	1.1	*0.5	*0.7	*0.8	*0.5	*0.2	0.8
Re-used it	36.1	34.9	48.9	47.1	44.6	38.5	50.4	30.0	40.1
Other	4.5	5.2	3.3	5.3	3.0	3.1	*2.6	4.0	4.3

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

RECYCLING METHOD *continued*

A significant finding of the survey was that re-using materials within the household had almost doubled in 2000 (83%) compared to 40% in 1996 and 42% in 1992.

This made it one of the primary methods of recycling used by Australian households in March 2000, the other being collection from the dwelling (also 83%). Households in the Australian Capital Territory and Victoria relied on the household collection service more than any other states (96% and 92% respectively), while the Northern Territory was the least dependent (54%) on this method of recycling. Taking materials to a central collection point other than the dump (69%), and composting or mulching (52%) were also favoured methods of recycling. Composting or mulching was most popular in Tasmania (63%), but least practiced in New South Wales (46%). In Australia, dropping off materials at special areas at the dump was the least used method, and has consistently remained below 10% for all three surveys. However, in Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory around a quarter of households took recycling material to a special area at the dump (26% and 22% respectively). Western Australia recorded the lowest proportion of households using this method (5%). Taking household waste materials to a central collection point other than the dump and collection from the dwelling has increased in popularity over the years since survey data was first collected.

**1.4 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Recycling Method (a)**

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Central collection points	1 604.2	1 178.1	883.0	456.7	488.1	129.7	35.5	93.0	4 868.4
Collection from house	2 010.1	1 609.3	1 092.8	429.2	488.1	119.4	27.7	115.4	5 892.0
Special areas at dump	192.2	163.6	142.0	42.8	37.3	46.7	8.3	26.6	659.6
Compost or mulch	1 079.6	947.1	800.1	308.6	345.9	112.8	28.0	73.2	3 695.2
Re-use within household	1 832.8	1 459.5	1 172.0	488.6	585.9	156.1	48.3	99.9	5 843.3
Other	280.7	276.4	166.7	88.5	98.3	28.1	6.9	11.1	956.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 338.7</b>	<b>1 758.3</b>	<b>1 333.0</b>	<b>594.5</b>	<b>685.7</b>	<b>179.3</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>120.3</b>	<b>7 061.3</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Central collection points	68.6	67.0	66.2	76.8	71.2	72.3	68.9	77.4	68.9
Collection from house	85.9	91.5	82.0	72.2	71.2	66.6	53.6	95.9	83.4
Special areas at dump	8.2	9.3	10.6	7.2	5.4	26.1	16.0	22.1	9.3
Compost or mulch	46.2	53.9	60.0	51.9	50.4	62.9	54.2	60.8	52.3
Re-use within household	78.4	83.0	87.9	82.2	85.4	87.1	93.6	83.1	82.8
Other	12.0	15.7	12.5	14.9	14.3	15.7	13.4	9.2	13.5
MARCH 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Central collection points	65.1	60.3	57.7	69.2	64.1	59.0	62.8	66.5	62.6
Collection from house	76.2	84.4	77.1	67.2	68.4	55.3	*8.6	97.4	76.3
Special areas at dump	7.3	8.4	9.3	5.3	6.3	21.1	*15.4	28.1	8.4
Compost or mulch	49.7	54.9	57.9	52.9	50.6	61.9	69.1	65.6	53.6
Re-use within household	35.9	35.0	49.1	46.4	42.2	46.5	68.9	41.3	40.2
Other	10.8	12.9	12.5	15.3	15.3	15.0	*12.7	*6.7	12.5

1.4 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Recycling Method (a) *continued*

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MAY 1992									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Central collection points	50.2	47.4	52.7	65.2	60.5	51.9	39.8	69.8	52.5
Collection from house	52.3	70.8	29.8	33.0	47.2	17.9	10.0	37.5	49.4
Special areas at dump	7.4	9.8	11.5	6.5	9.3	22.0	7.8	39.6	9.7
Compost or mulch	38.5	49.1	49.6	46.3	42.6	53.3	49.1	50.9	44.9
Re-use within household	35.2	43.0	45.7	46.2	48.9	50.3	41.6	49.5	41.9
Other	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.4	4.6	2.3	*2.9	4.1	2.8

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one method may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

In March 2000 one person households were the household type least involved in all methods of recycling and re-use, except for collection from the house. These results are similar to those which occurred in 1996. Couple with dependent child(ren) households generally were more engaged in recycling activity and accounted for the highest proportions for taking items to a special area at the dump (12%) and re-use within the household (88%).

## 1.5 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Recycling Method (a)

	One person	Couple only	Households with all members over 15	Couple, dependent child(ren)	One parent, dependent child(ren)	All other households	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARCH 2000							
Central collection points	58.8	71.6	74.6	74.1	75.4	64.5	68.9
Collection from house	83.0	82.1	86.4	82.7	80.9	86.0	83.4
Special areas at dump	5.2	11.4	9.7	12.2	7.8	8.2	9.3
Compost or mulch	38.4	59.7	58.8	57.4	54.2	46.8	52.3
Re-use within household	78.5	81.9	83.2	87.5	84.8	83.0	82.8
Other	10.8	14.1	13.0	16.6	16.5	11.4	13.5
MARCH 1996							
Central collection points	52.9	64.5	66.6	68.8	65.6	55.1	62.6
Collection from house	77.7	75.3	79.5	74.8	72.3	76.8	76.3
Special areas at dump	5.0	9.2	9.7	10.9	5.7	6.3	8.4
Compost or mulch	41.7	60.2	57.7	59.1	46.3	44.9	53.6
Re-use within household	31.6	41.3	38.0	46.7	45.4	39.3	40.2
Other	11.5	12.8	11.3	14.6	11.4	10.6	12.5

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one method may be specified.

## RECYCLING FREQUENCY

In March 2000 for three methods of recycling (namely, taking items to a central collection point other than the dump, collection from the dwelling and taking items to a special area at the dump), most Australian households that recycled paper (56%), glass (53%), cans (52%), plastic bottles (52%) and garden waste (39%) did so on a fortnightly basis. Weekly recycling was the next most favoured recycling frequency for these same items, with the exception of garden waste. Recycling 'as required' was the second choice for garden waste. Australian households predominantly recycled old clothing or rags and plastic bags as required (81% and 33% respectively), but the majority of kitchen or food waste was recycled weekly (85%). Monthly recycling was generally less common, except for garden waste and plastic bags (18% and 11% respectively).

## 1.6 HOUSEHOLDS WHO RECYCLE, Items Recycled By Frequency, March 2000

	<i>Paper</i>	<i>Glass</i>	<i>Cans</i>	<i>Plastic bottles</i>	<i>Plastic bags</i>	<i>Kitchen or food waste</i>	<i>Garden waste</i>	<i>Old clothing or rags</i>
NUMBER ('000)								
Weekly	1 914.3	2 225.6	2 029.8	2 258.6	288.2	387.6	189.3	22.0
Fortnightly	3 145.5	2 959.2	2 770.1	2 952.6	315.4	45.0	562.6	24.7
Monthly	313.3	147.7	133.6	142.2	129.7	*3.2	259.2	113.2
As required	191.2	241.6	351.9	254.1	385.6	16.6	326.8	3 878.1
Other	29.5	21.7	36.5	19.6	28.4	*2.5	105.3	675.0
Don't know	29.0	23.8	17.6	21.0	*7.9	*0.7	*9.9	54.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 622.9</b>	<b>5 619.9</b>	<b>5 339.5</b>	<b>5 648.2</b>	<b>1 155.2</b>	<b>455.6</b>	<b>1 453.1</b>	<b>4 767.3</b>
PROPORTION (%)								
Weekly	34.0	39.6	38.0	40.0	25.0	85.1	13.0	0.5
Fortnightly	55.9	52.7	51.9	52.3	27.3	9.9	38.7	0.5
Monthly	5.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	11.2	*0.7	17.8	2.4
As required	3.4	4.3	6.6	4.5	33.4	3.6	22.5	81.3
Other	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.3	2.5	*0.6	7.2	14.2
Don't know	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	*0.7	*0.2	*0.7	1.1

## HOUSEHOLDS NOT RECYCLING

The primary reason reported by households who gave a reason for not recycling all surveyed items in March 2000 was a lack of recyclable materials (73%), with Victoria having the highest proportion (79%). The proportion of households stating this reason has also substantially increased over time (1992, 20%; 1996, 51%; 2000, 73%). Other reasons were because there were no services or facilities available (16%) and lack of interest by the household (13%). The Northern Territory had the biggest percentage of households citing no services or facilities being available (46%). Western Australian households recorded the largest proportion for lack of interest (18%), while New South Wales households rated the highest percentage for specifying no storage area in their dwelling or yard (8%). Inadequate services or facilities was the least important reason (4%), but it was highest in Western Australia (7%). About 4% of households gave no reason for not recycling all items in the survey.

## 1.7 HOUSEHOLDS NOT RECYCLING ALL MATERIALS, Reasons For Not Recycling (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Not enough recyclable materials	1 631.3	1 322.9	932.5	437.3	400.7	119.5	29.4	82.2	4 955.9
No services or facilities provided	465.4	136.1	227.6	47.1	152.3	36.3	24.5	5.7	1 095.0
Not interested/Too much effort	295.5	209.0	156.9	82.5	123.1	25.3	6.9	13.7	912.8
No storage area in dwelling/yard	185.1	108.8	62.5	39.2	37.9	9.6	3.5	5.3	452.0
Uncertain of services or facilities provided	100.2	117.4	58.8	28.3	42.6	6.4	*1.4	*3.4	358.4
Inadequate services or facilities	101.8	31.0	28.8	17.9	50.3	4.8	3.0	*1.9	239.5
Other	139.8	97.8	97.7	37.0	67.2	11.6	5.9	9.7	466.6
No reason	104.7	60.1	59.5	24.5	32.4	5.3	*0.2	3.9	290.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 273.3</b>	<b>1 666.7</b>	<b>1 263.8</b>	<b>577.3</b>	<b>695.2</b>	<b>174.6</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>106.2</b>	<b>6 810.1</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Not enough recyclable materials	71.8	79.4	73.8	75.8	57.6	68.5	55.6	77.4	72.8
No services or facilities provided	20.5	8.2	18.0	8.2	21.9	20.8	46.3	5.4	16.1
Not interested/Too much effort	13.0	12.5	12.4	14.3	17.7	14.5	13.0	12.9	13.4
No storage area in dwelling/yard	8.1	6.5	4.9	6.8	5.5	5.5	6.7	5.0	6.6
Uncertain of services or facilities provided	4.4	7.0	4.7	4.9	6.1	3.7	*2.6	*3.2	5.3
Inadequate services or facilities	4.5	1.9	2.3	3.1	7.2	2.7	5.7	*1.8	3.5
Other	6.1	5.9	7.7	6.4	9.7	6.6	11.2	9.1	6.9
No reason	4.6	3.6	4.7	4.2	4.7	3.0	*0.3	3.7	4.3
MARCH 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Not enough recyclable materials	55.1	55.1	42.4	49.9	43.7	48.6	35.5	64.5	51.0
No services or facilities provided	22.9	17.1	32.8	14.3	29.2	25.1	39.8	*2.7	23.0
No storage area in dwelling/yard	11.5	7.2	9.1	7.1	5.8	*5.2	*2.7	*9.5	8.7
Uncertain of services or facilities	4.7	7.5	4.2	4.9	3.6	*7.0	*6.5	*2.3	5.2
Inadequate services or facilities	7.4	5.6	7.3	4.6	9.7	*8.5	*11.4	*2.4	6.9
Other	20.1	24.8	23.0	33.7	26.1	25.6	*30.8	*31	24.0
MAY 1992									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Not enough recyclable materials	21.2	23.7	14.0	13.4	17.6	12.2	15.9	36.6	19.5
No services or facilities provided	15.0	11.3	28.5	14.7	17.5	18.8	21.7	*2.8	16.6
No storage area in dwelling/yard	5.4	3.2	3.0	4.3	2.4	4.6	*4.4	*3.6	4.0
Uncertain of services or facilities	4.4	4.7	3.6	4.5	3.6	*3.1	*3.6	*6.4	4.3
Inadequate services or facilities	10.1	5.9	9.1	7.4	12.9	9.4	*5.3	*4.8	8.7
Other	15.6	12.0	14.2	16.4	18.5	20.3	16.9	26.1	15.0

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

HOUSEHOLDS NOT RECYCLING *continued*

One person households rated highest for stating that they did not use any or enough of the materials to warrant recycling (78%) and had no storage area for recycled materials (8%), but rated lowest for being uncertain of services or facilities available (5%) and for having no reason for not recycling (2%). Among the different household types, couple with dependent child(ren) recorded the highest proportions for citing no service or facilities being provided (17%) and inadequate services or facilities (4%). These observations also occurred in March 1996 when the survey was last conducted.

**1.8 HOUSEHOLDS NOT FULLY RECYCLING, Reasons For Not Recycling (a)**

	<i>One person</i>	<i>Couple only</i>	<i>Households with all members over 15</i>	<i>Couple, dependent child(ren)</i>	<i>One parent, dependent child(ren)</i>	<i>All other households</i>	<i>Total</i>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARCH 2000							
Not enough recyclable materials	78.2	72.9	69.7	68.0	73.1	72.7	72.8
No services or facilities provided	16.9	16.9	12.7	17.0	13.4	16.0	16.1
Not interested/Too much effort	13.9	10.9	14.5	13.8	13.7	15.3	13.4
No storage area in dwelling/yard	8.2	6.3	5.5	5.6	4.8	8.1	6.6
Uncertain of services or facilities provided	4.6	4.8	5.2	5.9	4.9	6.8	5.3
Inadequate services or facilities	3.4	3.3	3.6	4.1	*2.5	3.4	3.5
Other	6.2	7.0	7.4	7.5	7.2	6.0	6.9
No reason	2.2	4.7	6.2	4.8	4.1	4.9	4.3
MARCH 1996							
Not enough recyclable materials	63.4	51.8	48.6	42.7	44.7	45.3	51.0
No services or facilities provided	19.6	25.5	20.8	25.5	21.3	22.5	23.0
No storage area in dwelling/yard	9.9	7.5	7.0	7.8	11.0	11.6	8.7
Uncertain of services or facilities	4.4	5.1	3.3	5.8	6.5	7.8	5.2
Inadequate services or facilities	4.6	7.1	7.9	8.4	6.4	7.9	6.9
Other	20.2	20.8	29.4	26.8	27.4	26.1	24.0

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

## HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

In March 2000, 37% of Australian households knew of services or facilities that were available in their area for the safe disposal of household hazardous waste, a slight increase compared to 1996 (31%). The Australian Capital Territory reported the highest level of awareness (60%), while New South Wales households were the least aware of these facilities (only 34% reported being aware).

## 1.9 AWARENESS OF HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic.</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Tas.</i>	<i>NT(a)</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>Aust.</i>
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Yes	828.3	662.3	531.9	237.6	280.3	74.1	22.2	72.2	2 708.8
No	1 609.2	1 121.2	833.2	376.5	446.5	114.0	34.5	48.8	4 583.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 437.5</b>	<b>1 783.6</b>	<b>1 365.1</b>	<b>614.1</b>	<b>726.8</b>	<b>188.1</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>120.9</b>	<b>7 292.6</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Yes	34.0	37.1	39.0	38.7	38.6	39.4	39.1	59.7	37.1
No	66.0	62.9	61.0	61.3	61.4	60.6	60.9	40.3	62.9
MARCH 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Yes	29.0	29.7	29.6	34.4	34.5	33.4	41.8	43.4	30.7
No	71.0	70.3	70.4	65.6	65.5	66.6	58.2	56.6	69.3

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL METHOD

Disposal via the usual garbage collection service from the dwelling was the main method for getting rid of household hazardous waste in Australia and has increased between 1996 (62%) and 2000 (85%). The second most utilised method was to take the waste materials to a business or shop (1996, 25%; 2000, 24%). Burial remained the least used method (1996, 2%; 2000, 1%). The practice of taking household hazardous materials to the dump for disposal has declined (1996, 23%; 2000, 17%). A similar decline was also registered for taking household hazardous waste to a central collection point other than the dump (1996, 7%; 2000, 5%).

Disposal through the usual household garbage collection system was the preferred option for household batteries (93%) (in 1996 this category was "other batteries"), oven cleaners or their containers (90%), fluorescent tubes or globes (82%), metal cleaners or their containers (77%), garden chemicals or their containers (71%), pharmaceuticals such as medicines, drugs or ointments (54%), and paint products or their containers (52%).

Car batteries (1996, 41%; 2000, 46%) and motor oil (1996, 23%; 2000, 43%) were most likely to be left at a business or a shop. Other than having them taken away via the garbage collection service, households in Australia also preferred to pour their unwanted medicines, drugs or ointments down the drain or took them to a business or shop (both around 24%).

## 1.10 HOUSEHOLDS DISPOSING HAZARDOUS WASTE, Items Disposed By Method (a)

	<i>Garden chemicals</i>	<i>Paint products</i>	<i>Metal cleaners</i>	<i>Oven cleaners</i>	<i>Fluorescent tubes/globes</i>	<i>Car batteries</i>	<i>Household batteries</i>	<i>Motor oil</i>	<i>Pharma- ceuticals</i>	<i>Total</i>
MARCH 2000										
<b>Number ('000)</b>										
With usual garbage collection	747.4	621.3	341.7	1 560.9	1 161.3	57.9	3 871.0	74.1	1 486.6	4 842.9
Special service from house	79.8	126.0	30.4	53.2	64.5	110.4	28.8	31.5	14.5	405.8
Dump-general area	70.0	178.1	29.0	56.4	85.2	54.9	116.1	50.2	26.7	412.2
Dump-special area	81.8	182.1	22.4	12.3	23.3	193.1	46.3	181.3	11.0	533.8
Central collection point	31.3	38.7	*5.4	*4.6	11.9	86.5	28.6	60.0	57.3	258.4
Poured down the drain	*4.4	*6.6	*0.8	*1.7	—	—	—	*3.1	663.8	677.9
Taken to a business or shop	12.8	12.3	*3.1	*1.6	31.5	498.6	38.2	447.7	651.9	1 373.0
Buried them	*8.6	10.9	*6.2	*8.1	11.8	*2.3	18.7	24.1	27.1	81.7
Other	39.5	47.2	11.0	36.8	41.4	82.5	24.1	173.3	55.2	415.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 050.4</b>	<b>1 192.1</b>	<b>445.5</b>	<b>1 727.4</b>	<b>1 421.7</b>	<b>1 078.8</b>	<b>4 163.4</b>	<b>1 034.9</b>	<b>2 779.6</b>	<b>5 694.7</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>										
With usual garbage collection	71.2	52.1	76.7	90.4	81.7	5.4	93.0	7.2	53.5	85.0
Special service from house	7.6	10.6	6.8	3.1	4.5	10.2	0.7	3.0	0.5	7.1
Dump-general area	6.7	14.9	6.5	3.3	6.0	5.1	2.8	4.9	1.0	7.2
Dump-special area	7.8	15.3	5.0	0.7	1.6	17.9	1.1	17.5	0.4	9.4
Central collection point	3.0	3.2	*1.2	*0.3	0.8	8.0	0.7	5.8	2.1	4.5
Poured down the drain	*0.4	*0.6	*0.2	*0.1	—	—	—	*0.3	23.9	11.9
Taken to a business or shop	1.2	1.0	*0.7	*0.1	2.2	46.2	0.9	43.3	23.5	24.1
Buried them	*0.8	0.9	*1.4	*0.5	0.8	*0.2	0.5	2.3	1.0	1.4
Other	3.8	4.0	2.5	2.1	2.9	7.7	0.6	16.7	2.0	7.3



1.10 HOUSEHOLDS DISPOSING HAZARDOUS WASTE, Items Disposed By Method (a) *continued*

	<i>Garden chemicals</i>	<i>Paint products</i>	<i>Metal cleaners</i>	<i>Oven cleaners</i>	<i>Fluorescent tubes/globes</i>	<i>Car batteries</i>	<i>Other batteries</i>	<i>Motor oil</i>	<i>Pharma- ceuticals</i>	<i>Total</i>
MARCH 1996										
<b>Proportion (%)</b>										
With usual garbage collection	65.5	51.6	74.4	86.8	76.8	5.6	85.7	10.8	42.6	61.9
Special service from house	4.6	8.0	3.5	2.6	4.0	8.2	0.9	4.6	*0.5	6.2
Dump-general area	12.5	24.3	11.5	7.0	12.1	7.5	5.1	6.7	2.1	11.0
Dump-special area	10.8	12.5	6.0	1.8	3.3	19.8	2.7	23.0	*0.3	12.0
Central collection point	3.5	3.0	*2.9	*0.9	*0.9	13.0	2.3	10.5	1.3	6.6
Poured down the drain	*0.7	*1.0	*0.2	*0.1	—	*0.1	—	*0.4	25.5	11.0
Taken to a business or shop	2.0	*0.9	*1.7	*0.4	2.0	41.1	2.5	22.9	29.2	24.9
Buried them	*1.3	1.1	*0.4	*0.4	*0.7	1.5	0.9	4.0	1.3	2.3
Other	2.6	1.9	*0.9	*0.7	*0.8	4.2	*0.6	18.7	2.0	6.6

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one method may be specified.

## CHAPTER 2

## HABITS OF MOTOR VEHICLE OWNERS.....

### MAIN FINDINGS

Motor vehicles contribute around 16% of all Australian greenhouse gas emissions (Australian Greenhouse Office, 1998). They also inject minute particles of pollutants into the atmosphere which contribute towards respiratory illness. The number of vehicles, type, distance travelled, age of vehicle, level of efficiency as well as accessories installed, all have an impact on the environment. With the introduction of unleaded petrol in 1986, the proportion of vehicles running on leaded fuel continues to gradually decline.

- In March 2000 eighty nine percent of Australian households owned registered vehicles, with almost half (48%) owning two or more. Western Australia registered the highest vehicle ownership (93%).
- Almost a quarter (24%) of Australian households had purchased a motor vehicle in the 12 months prior to March 2000.
- One person households were the most likely to have no registered vehicles (29%), while households with all members over 15 years showed the strongest tendency for owning three or more vehicles (41%).
- Of those households owning vehicles, 18% had vehicles without air conditioning, with Tasmania having the highest proportion (46%). Vehicle air conditioning was most common in the Northern Territory (86%).
- The majority of household vehicles in Australia were run on unleaded petrol (73%). Tasmania (28%) and South Australia (24%) had the highest percentage of household vehicles using leaded fuel .
- The percentage of Liquefied Petroleum Gas or Liquefied Natural Gas (LPG/LNG) powered vehicles has remained similar to figures expressed in 1996, with the highest proportion in Victoria and South Australia (both around 9%).
- Nearly half (48%) the households owning vehicles chose to service their vehicles once every six months, while a little less than a third (30%) serviced them at least once every three months.
- Cost was the major factor considered in the purchase of a vehicle (54%), followed by fuel economy or running costs and vehicle size (both 36%). Environmental impact was the least important (3%).

## MOTOR VEHICLE OWNERSHIP

Registered vehicle ownership in Australian households has increased marginally from 87% in 1996 to 89% in March 2000. The proportion of households owning one and two vehicles has remained relatively static, while there was a slight increase in the proportion of households owning three or more vehicles. As in 1996, New South Wales had the highest percentage of households without motor vehicles (14%), while Western Australia registered the lowest percentage (7%). Western Australia also had the highest percentage of households with three or more vehicles (17%).

## 2.1 REGISTERED VEHICLES

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic.</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Tas.</i>	<i>NT(a)</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>Aust.</i>
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
None	343.0	183.5	133.5	61.6	51.4	18.6	4.4	9.9	805.8
One	1 088.8	647.5	560.6	258.9	284.5	70.4	23.1	48.4	2 982.3
Two	733.5	666.2	478.7	204.5	264.9	70.8	22.9	47.8	2 489.1
Three or more	272.2	286.4	192.3	89.1	126.1	28.4	6.3	14.8	1 015.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 437.5</b>	<b>1 783.6</b>	<b>1 365.1</b>	<b>614.1</b>	<b>726.8</b>	<b>188.1</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>120.9</b>	<b>7 292.6</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
None	14.1	10.3	9.8	10.0	7.1	9.9	7.8	8.2	11.0
One	44.7	36.3	41.1	42.2	39.1	37.4	40.8	40.0	40.9
Two	30.1	37.4	35.1	33.3	36.4	37.6	40.4	39.5	34.1
Three or more	11.2	16.1	14.1	14.5	17.3	15.1	11.0	12.2	13.9
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
None	16.8	11.0	11.8	10.8	8.5	11.3	*9.1	8.8	12.8
One	42.3	37.9	42.4	42.4	40.3	42.4	38.1	39.1	41.0
Two	31.1	37.1	33.7	34.7	35.6	32.1	40.9	38.0	34.0
Three or more	9.7	14.1	12.1	12.0	15.6	14.2	*11.9	14.2	12.2

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

MOTOR VEHICLE OWNERSHIP *continued*

One person households continued to rank highest for having no registered vehicles, as in 1996, although the proportion dropped from 36% in 1996 to 29% in March 2000. Couple with dependent child(ren) households were the least likely to have no vehicle (2%), and scored highest for owning two vehicles (59%). The one parent with dependent child(ren) households recorded the highest proportion for one vehicle ownership, while households with all members over 15 years recorded the strongest tendency for owning three or more vehicles (41%).

**2.2 REGISTERED VEHICLES**

	<i>One person</i>	<i>Couple only</i>	<i>Households with all members over 15</i>	<i>Couple, dependent child(ren)</i>	<i>One parent, dependent child(ren)</i>	<i>All other households</i>	<i>Total</i>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARCH 2000							
None	29.0	4.2	3.9	1.7	17.5	10.3	11.0
One	62.9	41.8	20.8	26.2	73.8	29.5	40.9
Two	6.5	45.2	33.8	58.7	7.2	36.0	34.1
Three or more	1.7	8.8	41.4	13.4	*1.4	24.2	13.9
APRIL 1996							
None	35.9	5.8	3.8	2.4	22.9	11.9	12.8
One	57.0	46.6	22.6	30.9	68.8	29.7	41.0
Two	5.8	41.0	36.2	55.2	7.8	35.8	34.0
Three or more	1.3	6.6	37.4	11.6	*0.4	22.6	12.2

## VEHICLE AIRCONDITIONING

Of Australian households who owned registered vehicles, the proportion owning vehicles without airconditioning has declined from 28% in 1996 to 18% in March 2000. Vehicle airconditioning was most common in the Northern Territory. It also had the highest proportion of households possessing two or more vehicles with airconditioning (39%). Tasmania continued to record the highest proportion of households owning vehicles without airconditioning, despite registering a drop since 1996 (1996, 63%; 2000, 46%).

## 2.3 HOUSEHOLDS WITH MOTOR VEHICLES, Airconditioning

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic.</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Tas.</i>	<i>NT(a)</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>Aust.</i>
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
None	385.7	237.3	239.4	88.4	112.6	77.3	7.1	16.0	1 163.8
One	1 135.4	820.9	651.5	296.5	338.2	69.4	24.5	58.0	3 394.5
Two	482.4	436.2	280.4	135.1	177.5	19.1	16.6	31.3	1 578.6
Three or more	87.0	102.1	57.6	30.4	45.5	*3.3	4.0	4.9	334.7
Don't know	*3.9	*3.7	*2.7	*2.1	*1.6	*0.4	—	*0.8	15.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 094.5</b>	<b>1 600.1</b>	<b>1 231.6</b>	<b>552.5</b>	<b>675.4</b>	<b>169.6</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>6 486.8</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
None	18.4	14.8	19.4	16.0	16.7	45.6	13.6	14.4	17.9
One	54.2	51.3	52.9	53.7	50.1	41.0	47.0	52.2	52.3
Two	23.0	27.3	22.8	24.5	26.3	11.3	31.7	28.2	24.3
Three or more	4.2	6.4	4.7	5.5	6.7	*1.9	7.7	4.4	5.2
Don't know	*0.2	*0.2	*0.2	*0.4	*0.2	*0.2	—	*0.7	0.2
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
None	29.2	24.4	29.6	25.2	28.0	62.7	19.6	28.4	28.4
One	50.4	49.7	50.6	52.9	49.6	31.9	48.4	50.4	49.9
Two	17.4	22.2	17.2	19.5	19.1	*4.6	28.9	18.7	18.7
Three or more	2.6	3.6	2.6	2.4	3.3	*0.6	*3.1	*2.5	2.9
Don't know	*0.3	*0.0	—	*0.1	—	*0.2	—	—	*0.1

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## VEHICLE FUEL TYPE

The majority of household vehicles in Australia in March 2000 were run on unleaded petrol (73%), with households in the Australian Capital Territory ranking highest for such vehicles (81%). Figures for New South Wales and the Northern Territory were the next highest (78% and 77% respectively). Nationally, between 1996 and March 2000, household vehicles running on unleaded petrol have increased substantially from 54% to 73%, with the change occurring across all states and territories. However, the proportion of household vehicles using leaded fuel was still reasonably high in Tasmania and South Australia (28% and 24% respectively).

There was a marginal increase in the proportion of household diesel vehicles (1996, 4.5%; 2000, 5.4%). The Northern Territory recorded the greatest proportion of households owning diesel powered vehicles (9%). The percentage of Liquefied Petroleum Gas or Liquefied Natural Gas (LPG/LNG) powered vehicles has remained similar to figures expressed in 1996, with most of them residing in Victoria and South Australia (both around 9%).

## 2.4 HOUSEHOLDS WITH MOTOR VEHICLES, Fuel Type

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Super	309.9	283.7	215.4	133.4	109.2	48.0	6.1	15.4	1 121.2
Unleaded	1 642.2	1 097.1	889.1	348.2	493.7	107.4	40.4	90.3	4 708.4
Diesel	98.0	57.3	98.8	21.7	53.4	11.3	4.7	*2.9	348.1
LPG/LNG	29.6	150.8	25.1	47.1	14.0	*1.8	*0.7	*2.4	271.6
Other	*1.7	*3.8	*0.5	*0.7	*2.8	—	*0.3	—	*9.8
Don't know	*13.1	*7.4	*2.6	*1.3	*2.4	*0.9	—	—	27.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 094.5</b>	<b>1 600.1</b>	<b>1 231.6</b>	<b>552.5</b>	<b>675.4</b>	<b>169.6</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>6 486.8</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Super/leaded	14.8	17.7	17.5	24.2	16.2	28.3	11.6	13.9	17.3
Unleaded	78.4	68.6	72.2	63.0	73.1	63.4	77.4	81.3	72.6
Diesel	4.7	3.6	8.0	3.9	7.9	6.7	9.0	*2.6	5.4
LPG/LNG	1.4	9.4	2.0	8.5	2.1	*1.1	*1.4	*2.1	4.2
Other	*0.1	*0.2	*0.0	*0.1	*0.4	—	*0.6	—	*0.2
Don't know	*0.6	*0.5	*0.2	*0.2	*0.4	*0.6	—	—	0.4
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Super/leaded	34.6	35.8	37.2	40.0	37.0	52.2	30.9	33.4	36.6
Unleaded	59.3	50.2	54.8	49.5	54.6	41.7	57.6	61.9	54.4
Diesel	4.2	3.5	6.1	2.5	6.2	5.2	*11.0	*1.6	4.5
LPG/LNG	1.5	9.8	1.7	7.7	1.8	*0.6	*0.5	*2.9	4.2
Other	*0.4	*0.6	*0.2	*0.2	*0.3	*0.2	—	*0.3	0.4

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## MOTOR VEHICLE MAINTENANCE

Nearly four out of every five households with motor vehicles serviced their vehicles at least once every six months (78%). Most preferred to service them on a six monthly basis (48%) rather than at least once every three months (30%) or once a year (13%). About 1% did not bother to service their vehicles and around 6% only serviced them when there was a problem. Although households in the Northern Territory were more inclined to service their vehicles at least once every three months (44%), this State also had the largest proportion of households who only serviced their vehicles when there was a problem (8%).

## 2.5 HOUSEHOLDS WITH MOTOR VEHICLES, Vehicle Servicing

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
At least once every three months	639.6	462.3	394.6	147.1	194.6	54.0	23.2	43.0	1 958.3
Once every six months	959.2	790.1	565.2	275.2	345.5	77.3	17.4	50.6	3 080.5
Once a year	275.0	199.1	151.4	72.1	79.6	20.9	5.5	9.4	812.9
Only when there is a problem	138.9	91.1	79.0	42.0	33.2	10.7	4.1	4.1	403.0
Never serviced	*15.6	*11.7	*7.2	*4.2	8.2	*1.2	*0.6	*0.6	49.3
Don't know	66.2	45.7	34.2	12.0	14.4	5.5	*1.5	*3.3	182.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 094.5</b>	<b>1 600.1</b>	<b>1 231.6</b>	<b>552.5</b>	<b>675.4</b>	<b>169.6</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>6 486.8</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
At least once every three months	30.5	28.9	32.0	26.6	28.8	31.8	44.4	38.7	30.2
Once every six months	45.8	49.4	45.9	49.8	51.2	45.6	33.3	45.6	47.5
Once a year	13.1	12.4	12.3	13.0	11.8	12.3	10.5	8.5	12.5
Only when there is a problem	6.6	5.7	6.4	7.6	4.9	6.3	7.9	3.7	6.2
Never serviced	*0.7	*0.7	*0.6	*0.8	1.2	*0.7	*1.1	*0.6	0.8
Don't know	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.2	2.1	3.3	*2.8	*3.0	2.8
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
At least once every three months	36.6	36.4	42.7	35.9	35.2	42.6	42.2	41.0	37.8
Once every six months	37.3	36.3	34.7	38.1	40.1	31.2	36.9	38.3	36.8
Once a year	11.4	11.0	9.3	11.1	8.9	12.8	*9.0	10.2	10.6
Only when there is a problem	5.9	6.2	4.8	5.8	6.1	5.9	*6.6	*3.3	5.7
Other	6.3	8.5	6.7	7.3	8.0	5.6	*4.2	*5.9	7.2
Never serviced	1.1	0.9	1.3	*1.4	*1.1	*1.5	*1.0	*0.9	1.1
Don't know	1.3	0.6	*0.5	*0.5	*0.6	*0.5	—	*0.5	0.8

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## MOTOR VEHICLE PURCHASE

In March 2000, 24% of Australian households had purchased a motor vehicle in the previous 12 months. Western Australia recorded the largest proportion (27%) and Victoria the smallest (22%).

## 2.6 HOUSEHOLDS PURCHASING MOTOR VEHICLES, March 2000

	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic.</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Tas.</i>	<i>NT(a)</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>Aust.</i>
NUMBER ('000)									
Yes	487.6	357.9	321.0	138.6	182.6	44.4	13.7	26.9	1 572.6
No	1 606.9	1 242.2	910.5	413.9	492.8	125.2	38.5	84.1	4 914.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 094.5</b>	<b>1 600.1</b>	<b>1 231.6</b>	<b>552.5</b>	<b>675.4</b>	<b>169.6</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>6 486.8</b>
PROPORTION (%)									
Yes	23.3	22.4	26.1	25.1	27.0	26.2	26.2	24.2	24.2
No	76.7	77.6	73.9	74.9	73.0	73.8	73.8	75.8	75.8

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.



MOTOR VEHICLE PURCHASE *continued*

Many factors were considered by households when purchasing a vehicle. The strongest determinant was the purchase cost of the vehicle (54%). This was particularly evident in the Northern Territory, which registered the highest proportion (70%). The next two crucial factors which influenced the decision were fuel economy/running costs and vehicle size (both 36%). These two factors were also exceptionally strong considerations in the Northern Territory (61% and 45% respectively).

Environmental impact rated last and had minimal impact on households in relation to buying a vehicle (3%). Across all factors, households in the Northern Territory consistently recorded many of the highest ratings, suggesting that Northern Territorians considered many more factors in their purchase of a motor vehicle than their counterparts in the other States. Conversely, Western Australians generally had lower levels in regard to most factors.

**2.7 HOUSEHOLDS PURCHASING VEHICLES, Factors Considered, March 2000 (a)**

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
NUMBER ('000)									
Purchase cost	256.4	207.1	182.7	68.8	91.0	24.1	9.5	13.9	853.7
Fuel economy/running costs	164.5	119.3	123.9	58.3	63.5	19.0	8.4	9.3	566.2
Size of vehicle	176.1	143.8	106.1	44.6	65.4	14.1	6.2	9.6	565.9
Reliability	160.7	116.2	90.6	45.0	53.2	12.7	4.3	7.9	490.6
Type of vehicle e.g. car, 4WD, van	128.9	91.6	93.3	23.0	51.0	14.0	4.9	5.4	412.1
Appearance	124.8	86.0	65.3	29.2	35.9	8.8	4.3	7.8	362.0
Accessories eg airconditioning, power steering	103.3	83.5	65.8	32.8	35.7	10.2	3.8	6.2	341.3
Manufacturer's reputation	88.0	53.9	36.8	14.2	17.1	5.5	4.0	3.6	223.1
Safety	77.8	61.3	32.1	14.6	24.7	4.9	*2.6	4.0	222.1
Age/low kilometres	70.0	56.3	41.1	15.5	16.9	7.2	3.1	3.7	213.8
Engine capacity/performance	57.2	45.7	38.2	22.2	17.3	4.3	*1.6	3.8	190.4
Environmental impact	19.9	*9.1	*6.9	*4.1	*3.9	*0.9	*0.9	*0.6	46.3
Other	55.9	44.0	44.8	17.0	26.8	6.5	*1.6	*2.8	199.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>487.6</b>	<b>357.9</b>	<b>321.0</b>	<b>138.6</b>	<b>182.6</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>1 572.6</b>
PROPORTION (%)									
Purchase cost	52.6	57.9	56.9	49.7	49.9	54.3	69.5	51.9	54.3
Fuel economy/running costs	33.7	33.3	38.6	42.1	34.8	42.7	61.1	34.7	36.0
Size of vehicle	36.1	40.2	33.0	32.2	35.8	31.8	45.0	35.9	36.0
Reliability	33.0	32.5	28.2	32.4	29.1	28.6	31.4	29.2	31.2
Type of vehicle e.g. car, 4WD, van	26.4	25.6	29.1	16.6	27.9	31.6	35.6	20.2	26.2
Appearance	25.6	24.0	20.3	21.1	19.7	19.7	31.2	29.1	23.0
Accessories eg airconditioning, power steering	21.2	23.3	20.5	23.7	19.6	23.0	27.5	23.2	21.7
Manufacturer's reputation	18.0	15.1	11.5	10.3	9.4	12.4	29.2	13.5	14.2
Safety	16.0	17.1	10.0	10.5	13.5	11.1	*18.8	14.9	14.1
Age/low kilometres	14.3	15.7	12.8	11.2	9.3	16.1	22.7	13.6	13.6
Engine capacity/performance	11.7	12.8	11.9	16.0	9.5	9.8	*11.6	14.3	12.1
Environmental impact	4.1	*2.5	*2.2	*3.0	*2.1	*2.1	*6.8	*2.2	2.9
Other	11.5	12.3	14.0	12.3	14.7	14.5	*11.8	*10.5	12.7

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one factor may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

MAIN FINDINGS

Australian households are highly dependent on the family car. This reliance is exacerbated by urban sprawl, large distances between major population centres, and the limited availability of public transport services in some areas. The frequent use of private motor vehicles, especially in urban cities, contributes significantly to traffic congestion, shortage of parking spaces, increased atmospheric pollution and the need for additional road construction.

- The vast majority of Australians drove a car, truck or van to work or study in March 2000 (76%). People in Tasmania were most likely to drive to work or study (82%).
- People in the 35 to 44 years old (83%), and 45 to 54 years old groups (81%) were the most likely to drive to work or study.
- Only about 12% used the public transport system as their main form of transport to work or study, mainly trains and buses (7% and 4% respectively). The highest proportions of public transport use were in New South Wales (18%) and Victoria (13%).
- Respondents between the age of 18 and 24 recorded the heaviest reliance on public transport (23%) and were also the most likely to travel as passengers in privately driven cars, trucks or vans (9%).
- The main reason for using public transport to travel to work or study (34%) was not owning a car. Only 2% of respondents did it for environmental reasons.
- Slightly less than a third (30%) of those not using public transport to travel to work or study reported that they did not have access to it. About a quarter (26%) stated that no service was available at the right time. Almost a fifth of Australians commuting to work or study claimed that public transport was unavailable to them (19%).
- Proximity of home to the workplace or place of study was the principal reason to walk or cycle to work or study (78%). Fourteen percent of the people who walked or cycled to work or study did so because there was no other option available to them.
- The main reason why people who drove to work or study took passengers from other households was because they worked or studied with or nearby to the passenger (57%).
- Dropping off children at school or childcare was the primary reason to take passengers from the same household for people who drove to work or study (52%).
- The majority of Australians preferred to drive their vehicles for day-to-day travel besides work or study (87%). Public transport for non-work or study travel was not popular, although the two major transport modes used were the bus and train (both about 8%).

## TRANSPORT TO WORK/STUDY

The majority of Australians drove a car, truck or van to work or study in March 2000 (76%). Only about 12% used the public transport system as their main form of transport to work or study, mainly trains and buses (7% and 4% respectively). Figures reported for March 2000 have decreased across all modes of transport when compared to those in 1996. The change may be partially due to a modification to the questions asked of respondents. In March 2000, households were asked for the main form of transport to work or study, whereas in 1996, they were asked for the *usual* forms of transport.

Of those who used public transport, people in New South Wales were most likely to travel to work or study using this method of transport (18%), with 12% catching trains. People in New South Wales were also the least likely to drive to work or study (70%). Victorians were the next most regular users of public transport (13%). Tasmanians use of public transport was the lowest (2%). The highest percentage of people boarding buses to work or study occurred in the Australian Capital Territory (8%).

With the exception of Victoria (2%) and South Australia (less than 1%), no other State or Territory households reported the use of tram or light rail. The use of aquatic transport (ferry or boat) to work or study was mainly confined to New South Wales (less than 1%), with negligible use in Queensland and Western Australian.

When comparing all States or Territories, people in Tasmania were most likely to drive to work or study (82%). Tasmanians also led in the use of motorbikes or scooters (2%), which were least likely to be used in Victoria (0.5%). The proportion of people walking to work or study was most significant in Tasmania (7%), but it registered the lowest figure for cycling of all States (less than 1%). However, Tasmania rated highest in the use of non-motorised transport to get to work or study (8%). Cycling and walking were lowest in Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory, both with less than 5%.

## 3.1 PERSONS WHO TRAVEL TO WORK/STUDY, Transport

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(a)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Train	353.9	181.0	49.9	*10.2	28.4	—	*0.2	—	623.6
Bus	158.7	45.6	48.7	40.6	44.8	*4.7	*2.8	13.6	359.7
Tram/Light rail	—	48.4	—	*1.7	—	—	—	—	50.1
Ferry/boat	*13.4	—	*1.5	—	*0.8	—	—	—	15.7
Taxi	*4.5	*0.7	*1.0	*1.5	*0.7	—	*0.2	*0.5	*9.1
Car/truck/van as driver	2 046.2	1 659.8	1 256.6	520.7	693.6	156.2	72.1	134.5	6 539.8
Car/truck/van as passenger	178.9	80.1	99.5	32.1	44.2	9.0	*5.5	8.5	457.9
Motorbike or motor scooter	*17.4	*10.2	*14.0	*9.7	*8.2	*4.0	*0.6	*1.9	66.0
Bicycle	*19.5	*19.6	27.0	*9.3	15.4	*1.0	*3.5	*2.9	98.4
Walk	133.4	105.8	62.1	33.6	22.4	13.8	*3.0	4.6	378.7
Other	*6.7	*5.9	*2.7	*2.6	*3.4	*1.9	*1.0	—	24.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 932.6</b>	<b>2 157.1</b>	<b>1 563.1</b>	<b>662.0</b>	<b>861.9</b>	<b>190.7</b>	<b>89.0</b>	<b>166.6</b>	<b>8 623.1</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Train	12.1	8.4	3.2	*1.5	3.3	—	*0.3	—	7.2
Bus	5.4	2.1	3.1	6.1	5.2	*2.4	*3.2	8.2	4.2
Tram/Light rail	—	2.2	—	*0.3	—	—	—	—	0.6
Ferry/boat	*0.5	—	*0.1	—	*0.1	—	—	—	0.2
Taxi	*0.2	—	*0.1	*0.2	*0.1	—	*0.3	*0.3	*0.1
Car/truck/van as driver	69.8	76.9	80.4	78.6	80.5	81.9	81.0	80.8	75.8
Car/truck/van as passenger	6.1	3.7	6.4	4.8	5.1	4.7	*6.2	5.1	5.3
Motorbike or motor scooter	*0.6	*0.5	*0.9	*1.5	*1.0	*2.1	*0.7	*1.1	0.8
Bicycle	*0.7	*0.9	1.7	*1.4	1.8	*0.5	*3.9	*1.7	1.1
Walk	4.5	4.9	4.0	5.1	2.6	7.3	*3.4	2.8	4.4
Other	*0.2	*0.3	*0.2	*0.4	*0.4	*1.0	*1.2	—	0.3
APRIL 1996(b)									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Train	12.9	9.4	4.8	3.5	6.1	—	—	—	8.5
Bus	9.0	4.4	5.5	9.3	7.0	7.8	*5.2	13.0	7.1
Car/truck/van as driver	73.4	80.4	79.2	78.5	80.4	79.9	80.8	76.4	77.6
Car/truck/van as passenger	6.2	5.5	8.2	9.6	9.7	9.0	*8.8	10.1	7.2
Motorbike or motor scooter	1.0	0.9	2.0	2.0	1.2	*0.7	*1.5	*2.2	1.3
Bicycle	2.1	2.9	3.6	3.8	2.3	*2.1	*6.0	*3.2	2.8
Walk	6.4	6.2	6.4	5.6	5.3	*10.7	*7.4	5.9	6.3
Other	1.6	4.1	1.2	*0.9	*0.8	*0.8	*3.1	—	2.0

(a) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

(b) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

TRANSPORT TO WORK/STUDY *continued*

As in the previous survey respondents in the age group 18 to 24 years recorded the heaviest reliance on public transport (1996, 28%; 2000, 23%) and were least likely to drive to work or study (1996, 64%; 2000, 61%). Compared to other age groups, they were also the most likely to travel as passengers in privately driven cars, trucks or vans (9%). The two highest proportions of people driving to work or study were the 35 to 44 years olds (83%) and 45 to 54 years olds (81%). Results in 1996 were similar.

Except for those aged 65 or more, there was not a great deal of difference in the use of bicycles across the various age groups. This was different to the 1996 result, which showed that the use of bicycles progressively declined with age. A subtle change in the question in March 2000 was the probable cause. The highest proportion recorded for walking to work or study was from those respondents aged 65 or more (13%).

**3.2 PERSONS WHO TRAVEL TO WORK/STUDY, Transport**

	AGE GROUP (YEARS).....						Total
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 and over	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARCH 2000							
Train	11.9	7.8	5.3	5.9	5.3	*2.6	7.2
Bus	10.0	3.9	2.2	2.4	2.8	*3.6	4.2
Tram/Light rail	1.0	0.8	*0.3	*0.2	*0.7	*1.1	0.6
Ferry/boat	*0.1	*0.4	*0.2	*0.1	—	—	0.2
Taxi	*0.1	*0.2	*0.1	*0.1	*0.1	—	*0.1
Car/truck/van as driver	60.5	74.6	82.5	81.3	79.4	74.3	75.8
Car/truck/van as passenger	8.9	5.5	3.9	4.2	4.3	*4.4	5.3
Motorbike or motor scooter	*0.6	1.1	0.8	*0.6	*0.5	—	0.8
Bicycle	1.3	1.4	0.9	1.0	*1.1	—	1.1
Walk	5.4	4.1	3.5	4.1	5.2	13.2	4.4
Other	*0.4	*0.2	*0.3	*0.2	*0.5	*0.8	0.3
APRIL 1996 (a)							
Train	14.0	7.8	7.7	5.7	6.5	*7.1	8.5
Bus	14.3	5.8	5.4	4.6	5.2	*2.4	7.1
Car/truck/van as driver	63.6	79.8	82.3	82.2	78.1	80.2	77.6
Car/truck/van as passenger	10.9	6.3	5.5	6.8	7.7	*3.5	7.2
Motorbike or motor scooter	0.8	1.8	1.3	1.5	*0.2	*1.0	1.3
Bicycle	4.9	3.0	2.3	1.4	1.8	—	2.8
Walk	9.6	4.8	5.2	6.1	6.7	*10.1	6.3
Other	2.5	2.1	1.1	2.5	1.8	*2.6	2.0

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Not owning a car was still the main reason nominated for using public transport to travel to work or study (1996, 34%; 2000, 34%). Other important reasons included parking problems (32%), proximity of home to public transport (29%) and cost (27%). When compared with data from the 1996 survey, the figures for parking problems and proximity of home to public transport as reasons for using public transport have increased considerably. Environmental concerns were relatively unimportant and suffered a drop (1996, 5%, 2000, 2%). Habit as a reason was the least important of all (1%).

**3.3 PERSONS USING PUBLIC TRANSPORT, Reasons (a)**

	'000	%
MARCH 2000		
Don't own car	358.0	34.1
Parking problems	333.6	31.8
Proximity of home to public transport	308.8	29.4
Cost	283.1	27.0
Time taken	178.4	17.0
Frequency of service	100.6	9.6
Other household member uses car	69.4	6.6
Personal safety	19.4	1.9
Environmental concerns	18.7	1.8
Habit	14.2	1.3
Other	142.0	13.5
APRIL 1996		
Don't own car	312.5	34.1
Parking problems	207.9	22.7
Proximity of home to public transport	164.0	17.9
Cost	263.3	28.7
Time taken	117.9	12.9
Frequency of service	51.1	5.6
Partner uses car	68.1	7.4
Personal safety	8.6	0.9
Environmental concerns	46.4	5.1
Habit	*5.7	*0.6
Other	205.0	22.4

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

## NON-USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Slightly less than a third (30%) of those not using public transport to travel to work or study reported that they did not have access to it. About a quarter (26%) stated that no service was available at the right or convenient time. These were the two primary reasons for not using public transport. Other reasons mentioned were excessive travel time (20%) and the need for a vehicle to be available before, during or after work or study hours (12%). The lack of service (36%) and the lengthy time required (26%) were the two major reasons nominated for avoiding the use of public transport in 1996. Personal safety was hardly an issue (1%).

The lack of service was most frequently reported in Queensland (40%), but was not an issue with many respondents in the Australian Capital Territory (3%). Victorians were the least concerned about the lack of service at the right or convenient time (22%), but this was considered to be a major hindrance by commuters in the Australian Capital Territory (46%). Victorians were the most likely to complain about travel time (27%). Northern Territory travellers had the strongest need for their vehicle before, during or after hours of work or study (21%), and along with the Tasmanians, comfort or privacy was most likely to be an influence for not using public transport (10% and 12% respectively). The cost of public transport was not an impediment to users, except in the Australian Capital Territory where it recorded the highest percentage by a small proportion of respondents (7%).

## 3.4 PERSONS NOT TAKING PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO WORK/STUDY, Reasons (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
No service available at all	563.7	474.3	512.0	163.7	200.3	56.1	23.1	4.4	1 997.6
No service available at right/convenient time	550.2	367.7	328.0	130.5	210.9	49.6	22.2	63.2	1 722.3
Takes too long	421.1	444.6	142.4	105.7	132.8	11.9	8.4	28.9	1 295.9
Own vehicle needed before/during/after hours	256.9	181.0	150.6	71.9	72.0	18.0	15.4	24.1	789.9
Comfort/privacy	145.6	165.1	53.5	37.0	37.6	18.9	7.6	7.5	472.8
Company or employer's vehicle needed during work/study hours	173.9	108.5	70.6	30.6	51.4	7.7	6.1	6.9	455.8
Carry equipment/tools	83.4	70.5	44.5	19.0	31.8	6.0	*4.0	*3.9	263.1
Cost considerations	*25.8	28.6	23.0	*8.4	*9.0	*1.6	*0.5	9.1	105.9
Concerned about own personal safety	37.9	26.8	*8.8	*6.4	*9.2	*2.3	*1.6	*0.3	93.3
Other	69.2	52.2	42.3	27.7	39.1	7.2	*0.7	7.5	246.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 068.1</b>	<b>1 670.7</b>	<b>1 271.7</b>	<b>531.8</b>	<b>702.6</b>	<b>160.3</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>137.0</b>	<b>6 615.0</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
No service available at all	27.3	28.4	40.3	30.8	28.5	35.0	31.7	3.2	30.2
No service available at right/convenient time	26.6	22.0	25.8	24.5	30.0	31.0	30.4	46.1	26.0
Takes too long	20.4	26.6	11.2	19.9	18.9	7.4	11.6	21.1	19.6
Own vehicle needed before/during/after hours	12.4	10.8	11.8	13.5	10.3	11.3	21.2	17.6	11.9
Comfort/privacy	7.0	9.9	4.2	7.0	5.3	11.8	10.4	5.5	7.1
Company or employer's vehicle needed during work/study hours	8.4	6.5	5.6	5.8	7.3	4.8	8.3	5.1	6.9
Carry equipment/tools	4.0	4.2	3.5	3.6	4.5	3.8	*5.5	*2.9	4.0
Cost considerations	*1.2	1.7	1.8	*1.6	*1.3	*1.0	*0.6	6.6	1.6
Concerned about own personal safety	1.8	1.6	*0.7	*1.2	*1.3	*1.5	*2.2	*0.2	1.4
Other	3.3	3.1	3.3	5.2	5.6	4.5	*1.0	5.5	3.7
MARCH 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
No service available at all	35.4	31.7	48.7	34.6	33.5	42.2	37.3	10.1	36.3
Takes too long	25.7	35.5	14.8	26.9	22.3	14.6	22.4	46.6	26.2
Vehicle needed during work hours	16.9	14.6	13.0	15.9	15.0	12.5	*13.2	22.9	15.3
Vehicle needed before/after work/study	5.7	8.7	6.8	11.4	9.1	11.1	*13.0	25.7	8.1
Infrequency of service	12.9	13.7	13.0	12.5	16.5	19.9	14.9	22.5	13.8
Comfort/privacy	9.5	12.2	6.6	12.5	7.6	9.6	20.6	21.8	10.1
Use company/employer's car	6.0	6.7	4.8	5.3	5.9	*5.4	*6.8	*6.2	5.9
Carry tools/equipment	9.6	7.4	6.7	7.3	5.8	6.7	*3.8	8.7	7.8
Reliability of service	5.0	7.5	3.7	5.8	2.7	*3.4	*2.7	15.9	5.4
Fares cost too much	3.1	5.2	3.2	3.8	1.7	*1.2	*2.1	14.8	3.7
Concerned about own personal safety	3.8	5.0	3.7	4.2	2.4	*1.3	*1.2	*2.9	3.9
Other	5.2	5.2	4.3	10.9	8.5	*5.4	*6.6	8.2	5.9

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.



NON-USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT *continued*

Compared to males, female travellers were more liable to complain about the lack of public transport service being available at the right or convenient time (28% and 25% respectively). Females were also more likely to worry about travel time (22%) than males (18%). They were also more concerned about comfort or privacy and personal safety (10% and 3% respectively) than males (5% and 0.5% respectively). Conversely, males were more likely than females to state that they needed a vehicle during work or study hours and for carrying equipment or tools (6% and 2% respectively). Similar results were experienced in 1996.

### 3.5 PERSONS NOT TAKING PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO WORK/STUDY, Reasons (a)

	Males	Females	Persons
	%	%	%
MARCH 2000			
No service available at all	29.9	30.7	30.2
No service available at right/convenient time	24.5	28.2	26.0
Takes too long	18.0	21.9	19.6
Own vehicle needed before/during/after hours	14.3	8.7	11.9
Comfort/privacy	5.4	9.6	7.1
Company or employer's vehicle needed during work/study hours	10.2	2.3	6.9
Carry equipment/tools	5.6	1.7	4.0
Cost considerations	1.5	1.7	1.6
Concerned about own personal safety	0.5	2.7	1.4
Other	2.8	5.0	3.7
APRIL 1996			
No service available at all	35.6	37.2	36.3
Takes too long	23.1	30.5	26.2
Vehicle needed during work hours	19.2	9.8	15.3
Vehicle needed before/after work/study	5.7	11.4	8.1
Infrequency of service	12.1	16.2	13.8
Comfort/privacy	8.4	12.4	10.1
Use company/employer's car	8.8	1.9	5.9
Carry tools/equipment	11.0	3.4	7.8
Reliability of service	4.5	6.7	5.4
Fares cost too much	2.7	5.2	3.7
Concerned about own personal safety	1.1	7.7	3.9
Overloading of service	0.7	0.8	0.7
Other	5.3	5.0	5.2

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT AVAILABILITY

Availability of public transport to travel to work or study has not changed much since 1996. Almost a fifth of Australians commuting to work or study claimed that public transport was unavailable (1996, 20%; 2000, 19%). Two thirds of respondents felt that bus services were readily available (65%), with the greatest accessibility being reported in the Australian Capital Territory (1996, 93%; 2000, 97%). Victoria and Queensland experienced the lowest levels of public transport accessibility (both about 58%). The other forms of public transport had less coverage than buses, with some forms absent in some States. Where rail service was concerned, its use was reported most frequently in Victoria (1996, 46%; 2000, 49%) and New South Wales (1996, 44%; 2000, 48%). Victorians also had good accessibility to trams or light rail (1996, 23%; 2000, 24%).

## 3.6 PERSONS COMMUTING TO WORK OR STUDY, Public Transport Availability (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Train	870.0	637.2	206.6	67.6	126.7	—	—	—	1 908.1
Bus	1 212.0	761.7	419.5	286.2	316.8	68.5	32.9	96.0	3 193.6
Tram/Light rail	—	312.2	—	*7.4	*0.8	—	—	—	320.5
Ferry	53.5	—	*13.5	—	*3.1	*1.5	—	—	71.6
None	325.6	227.6	203.5	65.0	98.8	15.0	10.4	*2.4	948.4
Don't know	*22.9	41.6	29.7	*11.9	18.1	*1.5	*0.5	*0.6	126.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 818.7</b>	<b>1 315.1</b>	<b>723.2</b>	<b>367.8</b>	<b>450.8</b>	<b>85.0</b>	<b>43.8</b>	<b>99.0</b>	<b>4 903.2</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Train	47.8	48.5	28.6	18.4	28.1	—	—	—	38.9
Bus	66.6	57.9	58.0	77.8	70.3	80.6	75.2	97.0	65.1
Tram/Light rail	—	23.7	—	*2.0	*0.2	—	—	—	6.5
Ferry	2.9	—	*1.9	—	*0.7	*1.7	—	—	1.5
None	17.9	17.3	28.1	17.7	21.9	17.6	23.8	*2.4	19.3
Don't know	*1.3	3.2	4.1	*3.2	4.0	*1.8	*1.0	*0.6	2.6
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Train	44.3	46.3	23.0	19.2	25.9	—	—	—	35.2
Bus	65.1	57.8	59.8	78.3	70.3	79.6	70.4	93.0	65.0
Tram	—	22.9	—	2.0	—	—	—	—	6.3
Ferry	2.1	—	1.6	—	*0.6	*0.7	—	—	1.1
None	18.2	16.6	28.3	17.7	23.9	20.4	26.8	6.8	19.7
Don't know	2.6	2.6	4.0	1.8	1.9	—	*2.8	*0.4	2.6

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## WALKING/CYCLING TO WORK/STUDY

In March 2000 proximity of home to the office or place of study was the principal reason reported for walking or cycling to work or study (1996, 62%; 2000, 78%), with Victoria recording the highest proportion (85%) followed by New South Wales (81%). The lowest percentage was in the Australian Capital Territory (43%).

Although sustaining a noticeable drop, walking or cycling for exercise or health (1996, 36%; 2000, 28%) remained the second most important reason. People from the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory were the most likely to walk or cycle for exercise or health (75% and 73% of those who reported this form of travel respectively). Cost was also an incentive (about 14% in 1996 and 2000), and was most marked in the Northern Territory (1996, 39%; 2000, 54%). In March 2000, 14% of people who walked or cycled to work or study did so because there was no other option available to them (1996 10%), with the highest proportion occurring in Queensland (20%). Personal safety and the availability of cycle paths were not strong determinants (both less than 1%).

## 3.7 PERSONS WHO WALK/CYCLE TO WORK/STUDY, Reasons (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Proximity to work/school/college/university	123.0	106.4	64.3	34.0	25.2	11.1	*3.5	*3.2	370.8
Exercise/health	33.3	27.1	29.3	*11.6	18.2	*3.4	*4.7	5.6	133.3
No other transport available	*17.7	*15.9	21.3	*2.0	*6.4	*1.4	*0.5	*1.5	66.5
Cost	*14.4	*13.7	*18.0	*7.5	*6.2	*1.0	*3.5	*1.4	65.6
Availability of cycle paths	—	*1.2	*1.1	—	*1.3	—	—	*0.2	*3.7
Personal safety	—	*1.3	*0.7	—	—	—	—	—	*2.0
Other	*11.1	*11.4	*6.7	*5.6	*8.4	*1.8	*0.5	*2.1	47.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>152.9</b>	<b>125.5</b>	<b>89.1</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>477.1</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Proximity to work/school/college/university	80.5	84.8	72.2	79.1	66.7	75.0	*54.2	*43.3	77.7
Exercise/health	21.8	21.6	32.8	*27.0	48.1	*23.2	*72.9	75.4	27.9
No other transport available	*11.5	*12.6	23.9	*4.6	*16.9	*9.6	*7.0	*20.6	13.9
Cost	*9.4	*10.9	*20.2	*17.4	*16.4	*6.9	*54.0	*18.7	13.8
Availability of cycle paths	—	*0.9	*1.2	—	*3.3	—	—	*2.4	*0.8
Personal safety	—	*1.0	*0.8	—	—	—	—	—	*0.4
Other	*7.3	*9.1	*7.5	*13.1	*22.1	*12.0	*7.0	*27.8	9.9
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Proximity to work/school/college/university	59.9	66.3	62.2	55.7	66.4	68.1	*62.1	*60.8	62.0
Exercise/health	42.1	34.7	29.4	38.9	30.9	*23.1	*63.5	—	36.4
No other transport available	9.8	10.2	18.2	*1.1	*4.2	*11.7	*6.3	*10.8	10.3
Cost	13.3	11.3	17.3	24.0	*11.7	—	*38.6	*11.4	14.1
Other	10.8	15.2	14.2	22.4	*14.7	*23.7	*10.9	*23.6	14.7

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

WALKING /CYCLING TO WORK/STUDY *continued*

The majority of respondents who did not walk or cycle to work or study emphasised that the distance was too far (77%). The highest percentage of people stating this reason occurred in Queensland (80%), followed by Victoria (78%), while the Northern Territory was the lowest (63%). The second but relatively less important reason for not walking or cycling was that a vehicle was needed before, during or after work or study hours (13%), with people from the Northern Territory reporting this most frequently (22%).

Bicycle ownership was a minor issue (9%), with the highest proportion of people not owning one in the Northern Territory (13%). A small proportion reported a lack of time (8%) and lack of interest (5%). Likewise, health or physical restrictions and traffic or road problems prevented only a minority from walking or cycling (3%). The lack of suitable pathways was also an insignificant reason (2%).

**3.8 PERSONS NOT WALKING/CYCLING TO WORK/STUDY, Reasons March 2000 (a)**

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
NUMBER ('000)									
Work/study distance is too far	2 152.7	1 579.9	1 173.5	456.6	593.8	128.2	51.6	111.3	6 247.7
Need motor vehicle before/during/after hours	292.5	266.8	213.9	81.0	131.4	24.0	18.0	22.8	1 050.5
Doesn't own bicycle	352.9	150.1	81.9	50.6	74.1	14.7	10.6	8.0	743.0
Need to carry goods/equipment	205.2	172.1	137.6	56.0	67.9	16.1	10.5	7.0	672.4
Lack of time	190.6	207.6	81.6	61.4	74.9	17.2	11.1	18.9	663.3
Not interested	125.8	127.6	67.9	35.2	52.2	12.8	7.8	5.8	435.0
Concerned about own personal safety	170.5	71.3	71.2	38.7	35.5	6.5	*2.7	*3.1	399.6
Health/physical restrictions	89.0	53.9	44.3	19.6	26.6	*4.5	*1.8	6.6	246.2
Traffic/road problems	131.4	49.3	26.6	*10.2	14.4	*5.1	—	*1.0	238.0
Lack of suitable pathways	66.6	24.1	*11.2	*5.3	*8.1	*4.1	*0.6	*1.4	121.3
Other	125.8	87.0	60.7	35.6	57.1	8.1	10.6	7.8	392.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 779.7</b>	<b>2 031.7</b>	<b>1 474.0</b>	<b>619.0</b>	<b>824.1</b>	<b>175.9</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>159.1</b>	<b>8 146.0</b>
PROPORTION (%)									
Work/study distance is too far	77.4	77.8	79.6	73.8	72.1	72.9	62.5	69.9	76.7
Need motor vehicle before/during/after hours	10.5	13.1	14.5	13.1	15.9	13.6	21.8	14.3	12.9
Doesn't own bicycle	12.7	7.4	5.6	8.2	9.0	8.4	12.9	5.1	9.1
Need to carry goods/equipment	7.4	8.5	9.3	9.0	8.2	9.2	12.7	4.4	8.3
Lack of time	6.9	10.2	5.5	9.9	9.1	9.8	13.4	11.9	8.1
Not interested	4.5	6.3	4.6	5.7	6.3	7.3	9.4	3.7	5.3
Concerned about own personal safety	6.1	3.5	4.8	6.2	4.3	3.7	*3.3	*2.0	4.9
Health/physical restrictions	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.2	*2.6	*2.2	4.2	3.0
Traffic/road problems	4.7	2.4	1.8	*1.6	1.7	*2.9	—	*0.6	2.9
Lack of suitable pathways	2.4	1.2	*0.8	*0.9	*1.0	*2.3	*0.7	*0.9	1.5
Other	4.5	4.3	4.1	5.8	6.9	4.6	12.8	4.9	4.8

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

WALKING/CYCLING TO WORK/STUDY *continued*

In March 2000, the highest proportion of people who stated that distance to work or study was too far to walk or cycle encompassed respondents between the age of 18 and 24 (81%). There was a distinct difference between the youngest and oldest age groups concerning the need for a motor vehicle, the need to carry goods or equipment, concerns about personal safety and health or physical restrictions for not walking or cycling to work or study. The youngest group recorded the lowest proportions while the oldest group the highest. In addition, the oldest age group also ranked highest for lack of interest as a reason for not walking or cycling to work or study. People between the age of 25 and 34 years recorded the highest percentage for citing a lack of time as a reason for not walking or cycling (9%). The lack of time was less of an issue for those above the age of 55. Those in the 55 to 64 age bracket were the most likely not to own a bicycle (12%).

### 3.9 PERSONS NOT WALKING/CYCLING TO WORK/STUDY, Reasons March 2000 (a)

	AGE GROUP (YEARS).....						Total %
	18-24 %	25-34 %	35-44 %	45-54 %	55-64 %	65 and over %	
Work/study distance is too far	80.5	76.2	76.3	77.5	71.9	57.0	76.7
Need motor vehicle before/during/after hours	6.6	13.1	15.1	14.2	14.4	21.3	12.9
Doesn't own bicycle	10.8	10.3	6.8	8.2	11.7	*8.8	9.1
Need to carry goods/equipment	5.6	7.0	8.9	9.4	11.7	16.4	8.3
Lack of time	8.4	8.8	8.2	8.3	5.2	*7.1	8.1
Not interested	6.6	5.1	4.9	5.2	4.7	*8.2	5.3
Concerned about own personal safety	5.5	5.7	4.0	4.5	4.1	*10.1	4.9
Health/physical restrictions	1.5	1.9	2.5	4.0	7.3	15.8	3.0
Traffic/road problems	2.7	3.7	2.9	2.3	2.9	—	2.9
Lack of suitable pathways	*0.7	1.6	1.6	2.0	*1.4	*0.5	1.5
Other	4.8	5.4	5.1	4.0	4.1	*7.3	4.8

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

## PASSENGERS FROM OTHER HOUSEHOLDS

The main reason why people who drove to work or study took passengers from other households was because they worked or studied with or nearby to the passenger (1996, 50%; 2000, 57%). Living nearby or on the way to work or study was the second most common reason (1996, 34%; 2000, 29%). Concern about the environment ranked last (1996, 4%; 2000, 1%).

### 3.10 PERSONS TAKING PASSENGERS FROM OTHER HOUSEHOLDS, Reasons (a)

	'000	%
MARCH 2000		
Work/study with or nearby passenger	227.2	57.0
They live nearby or on the way to work/educational institution	115.3	28.9
To save on travel costs	85.7	21.5
As a favour	73.4	18.4
Public transport not suitable for passenger	27.8	7.0
Drop children from another household at school	18.9	4.8
For company or conversation	*10.9	*2.7
Because of environmental concerns	*4.0	*1.0
Other	22.6	5.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>398.6</b>	
APRIL 1996		
Work/study with or nearby passenger	198.9	49.5
They live nearby or on the way to work/educational institution	134.8	33.5
To save on travel costs	85.1	21.2
As a favour	54.1	13.5
Drop children from another household at school	25.9	6.4
For company or conversation	12.0	3.0
Because of environmental concerns	14.3	3.6
Other	37.5	9.3

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

## PASSENGERS FROM OWN HOUSEHOLD

Dropping off children at school or childcare was the primary reason to take passengers from the same household for people who drove to work or study (1996, 37%; 2000, 52%). Concern about the environment was reported by less than 1% of respondents as a reason for taking passengers from the same household.

## 3.11 PERSONS TAKING PASSENGERS FROM OWN HOUSEHOLD, Reasons (a)

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Work/study with or near passenger	92.7	71.7	55.4	21.4	29.3	6.0	*5.1	9.8	291.3
Pass by passenger's destination on way to work/educational institution	55.4	51.6	37.7	18.0	*11.5	8.3	*1.7	5.9	190.2
To save on travel costs	*15.7	*21.9	21.8	*6.6	*3.8	*2.1	*0.2	*3.8	75.9
As a favour	*4.3	*2.2	*7.7	*1.2	—	*0.5	*0.8	—	16.7
Public transport not suitable for passenger	*10.5	*10.7	*8.5	*2.6	*2.0	*0.4	*0.8	*1.0	36.4
Drop children at school/childcare	162.2	95.2	113.0	26.8	44.5	11.2	9.2	11.0	473.2
For company or conversation	*1.4	*7.1	*3.1	*0.7	—	*0.2	—	—	12.5
Because of environmental concerns	*0.7	*5.1	*0.9	—	—	—	—	—	*6.7
Other	*11.3	*4.8	*6.9	*2.4	*4.4	*0.8	—	—	30.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>285.3</b>	<b>210.1</b>	<b>196.6</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>85.0</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>904.0</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Work/study with or near passenger	32.5	34.1	28.2	34.0	34.4	25.9	*33.7	37.9	32.2
Pass by passenger's destination on way to work/educational institution	19.4	24.6	19.2	28.7	*13.6	35.9	*11.1	22.8	21.0
To save on travel costs	*5.5	*10.4	11.1	*10.5	*4.5	*9.1	*1.5	*14.7	8.4
As a favour	*1.5	*1.1	*3.9	*1.9	—	*2.0	*5.0	—	1.8
Public transport not suitable for passenger	*3.7	*5.1	*4.3	*4.1	*2.3	*1.7	*5.1	*4.0	4.0
Drop children at school/childcare	56.9	45.3	57.5	42.6	52.4	48.3	60.6	42.7	52.3
For company or conversation	*0.5	*3.4	*1.6	*1.1	—	*0.8	—	—	1.4
Because of environmental concerns	*0.2	*2.4	*0.5	—	—	—	—	—	*0.7
Other	*4.0	*2.3	*3.5	*3.8	*5.2	*3.7	—	—	3.4
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Work/study with or nearby passenger	36.4	39.3	26.9	34.4	23.1	*20.8	*20.6	37.7	33.2
Pass by passengers destination	14.6	14.0	19.2	*8.5	26.1	*44.9	*17.9	*25.5	17.2
To save on travel costs	10.9	10.8	15.2	*4.6	*4.9	*11.9	*7.6	*21.0	11.1
Public transport not suitable	8.0	7.7	9.2	*4.3	*8.0	*6.1	*11.6	*6.0	7.8
Drop children at school	34.1	33.7	41.3	49.4	35.7	*23.5	*49.0	*27.9	36.6
Other	13.5	15.8	10.1	*14.7	15.9	*17.6	*23.9	*12.1	13.9

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

PASSENGERS FROM OWN HOUSEHOLD *continued*

The main reason for drivers not to take passengers from their own household on their way to work or study was that the passengers worked or studied in a different direction or location (1996, 37%; 2000, 51%). People in the same household not requiring any transport was the next important reason (1996, 37%; 2000, 33%), followed by irregular or different hours (1996, 36%; 2000, 29%).

**3.12 PERSONS NOT TAKING PASSENGERS FROM OWN HOUSEHOLD, Reasons (a)**

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
MARCH 2000									
<b>Number ('000)</b>									
Work/study in different direction/location	806.7	723.4	462.2	218.5	275.8	51.9	22.2	47.6	2 608.1
Others do not require any transport	593.0	431.6	307.2	125.4	144.5	47.6	10.5	24.9	1 684.6
Work/study irregular/different hours	448.6	351.8	291.0	115.0	188.1	44.4	12.0	28.6	1 479.5
Another vehicle is available	199.5	230.7	135.9	40.3	103.3	14.4	13.7	10.4	748.2
Reluctant to commit to regular start/ finish times	*18.1	*18.1	*6.0	*7.6	*3.6	*1.3	*0.8	*0.8	56.1
Others take public transport	*14.7	*11.4	*3.3	*1.2	*5.9	*2.2	*1.6	*0.4	40.7
Other	51.3	30.0	33.0	15.9	25.1	*2.5	*3.8	*3.2	164.7
Don't know/No reason	*10.5	*11.4	*6.5	*1.3	*5.0	*1.6	*1.2	—	37.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 625.4</b>	<b>1 308.5</b>	<b>953.0</b>	<b>400.0</b>	<b>536.5</b>	<b>116.9</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>96.0</b>	<b>5 082.1</b>
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Work/study in different direction/location	49.6	55.3	48.5	54.6	51.4	44.4	48.5	49.5	51.3
Others do not require any transport	36.5	33.0	32.2	31.4	26.9	40.8	22.8	25.9	33.1
Work/study irregular/different hours	27.6	26.9	30.5	28.8	35.1	38.0	26.1	29.8	29.1
Another vehicle is available	12.3	17.6	14.3	10.1	19.3	12.3	29.9	10.8	14.7
Reluctant to commit to regular start/ finish times	*1.1	*1.4	*0.6	*1.9	*0.7	*1.1	*1.8	*0.8	1.1
Others take public transport	*0.9	*0.9	*0.4	*0.3	*1.1	*1.9	*3.4	*0.4	0.8
Other	3.2	2.3	3.5	4.0	4.7	*2.2	*8.2	*3.3	3.2
Don't know/No reason	*0.6	*0.9	*0.7	*0.3	*0.9	*1.4	*2.5	—	0.7
APRIL 1996									
<b>Proportion (%)</b>									
Work/study in different location	33.9	41.7	33.1	34.4	45.2	30.9	38.4	42.5	37.1
Others do not require transport	38.6	37.7	36.7	41.0	29.9	37.7	34.2	27.6	37.1
Work/study irregular/different hours	34.1	36.0	38.8	34.1	35.9	31.0	36.2	41.7	35.7
Another vehicle is available	12.9	18.4	18.2	16.4	13.1	21.6	*18.3	28.6	16.1
Reluctant to commit to regular times	3.1	3.5	3.2	4.3	4.3	*1.3	*4.5	*6.5	3.5
Others take public transport	3.1	2.1	2.6	2.6	*0.8	*2.6	*1.7	*3.9	2.5
Other	4.5	4.4	3.1	*1.4	2.3	*1.8	*3.3	*4.2	3.7

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one reason may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.



## NON-WORK TRANSPORT

In March 2000, the majority of Australians preferred to drive their vehicles for day-to-day travel besides work or study (87%). Travelling as a passenger was the next most selected option, registering only 18%, and walking ranked third at 16%. The use of public transport for travel for non-work or study was not popular, although the two major transport modes used were the bus and train (both about 8%). Cycling was least favoured (4%).

## 3.13 PERSONS WHO TRAVEL OTHER THAN TO WORK/STUDY, Transport (a), March 2000

	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT(b)	ACT	Aust.
NUMBER ('000)									
Train	310.3	200.6	72.9	20.0	47.7	—	—	*0.2	651.7
Bus	324.7	110.5	100.6	48.7	49.5	11.5	7.6	12.1	665.1
Tram/Light rail	*0.7	142.5	—	*2.4	—	—	—	—	145.6
Ferry/boat	*27.8	—	*11.3	—	—	*0.6	—	—	39.6
Taxi	101.2	44.1	46.5	*10.9	21.9	*3.7	8.3	6.8	243.6
Car/truck/van as driver	2 413.6	1 892.8	1 396.1	606.8	786.9	171.8	76.2	151.4	7 495.6
Car/truck/van as passenger	524.1	350.0	298.3	91.2	164.7	38.4	20.6	27.2	1 514.5
Motorbike or motor scooter	*20.8	35.3	31.1	14.3	21.4	*5.1	*0.6	*2.4	130.9
Bicycle	84.3	86.8	81.3	27.7	55.6	8.0	13.8	17.3	374.6
Walk	492.3	396.7	188.8	100.0	131.0	31.7	22.0	31.3	1 393.8
Other	*15.9	*6.2	*5.9	*1.5	*3.2	*2.3	*1.2	—	36.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 929.8</b>	<b>2 157.1</b>	<b>1 563.1</b>	<b>662.0</b>	<b>861.9</b>	<b>190.7</b>	<b>89.0</b>	<b>166.6</b>	<b>8 620.4</b>
PROPORTION (%)									
Train	10.6	9.3	4.7	3.0	5.5	—	—	*0.1	7.6
Bus	11.1	5.1	6.4	7.4	5.7	6.0	8.5	7.3	7.7
Tram/Light rail	—	6.6	—	*0.4	—	—	—	—	1.7
Ferry/boat	*0.9	—	*0.7	—	—	*0.3	—	—	0.5
Taxi	3.5	2.0	3.0	*1.7	2.5	*1.9	9.4	4.1	2.8
Car/truck/van as driver	82.4	87.7	89.3	91.7	91.3	90.1	85.6	90.9	87.0
Car/truck/van as passenger	17.9	16.2	19.1	13.8	19.1	20.1	23.2	16.3	17.6
Motorbike or motor scooter	*0.7	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	*2.7	*0.7	*1.4	1.5
Bicycle	2.9	4.0	5.2	4.2	6.5	4.2	15.5	10.4	4.3
Walk	16.8	18.4	12.1	15.1	15.2	16.6	24.7	18.8	16.2
Other	*0.5	*0.3	*0.4	*0.2	*0.4	*1.2	*1.4	—	0.4

(a) Totals do not equal the sum of items in each column because more than one transport mode may be specified.

(b) Northern Territory data refers mainly to urban areas.

## EXPLANATORY NOTES .....

### INTRODUCTION

**1** This publication presents results from a supplementary survey run in association with the March 2000 Monthly Population Survey.

### METHODOLOGY

#### Monthly Population Survey

**2** The Monthly Population Survey is based on a multi-stage area sample of private dwellings (approximately 31,000 houses, flats, etc.) and a list sample of non-private dwellings (hotels, motels, etc.). The proportion of Australian dwellings selected this way is approximately 0.5%. For this survey, half the private dwelling sample (i.e. 15,500 dwellings) was used. Information was obtained by personal interviews from responsible adult members of selected households, whose next birthday was closest to the date of the interview. The information obtained related to the week before the interview (i.e. the reference week).

### SCOPE

**3** The survey covers rural and urban areas across all States and Territories of Australia, however the Northern Territory data refers to mainly urban areas. Also excluded were some 175,000 persons living in remote and sparsely settled parts of Australia. The exclusion of these persons will have only a minor impact on any aggregate estimates that are produced for individual States and Territories, with the exception of the Northern Territory where such persons account for over 20% of the population.

Persons aged 18 years and over who were usual residents of private dwellings were included in the surveys except:

- members of the Australian permanent defence forces;
- certain diplomatic personnel of overseas governments, customarily excluded from censuses and surveys;
- overseas residents in Australia;
- members of non-Australian defence forces (and their dependents) stationed in Australia; and
- residents of other non-private dwellings such as hospitals, motels and gaols.

### COVERAGE

**4** Coverage rules were applied which aimed to ensure that each person was associated with only one dwelling, and hence had only one chance of selection in each survey.

### DATA COMPARABILITY

**5** A set of changing topics rotate over a period of three years. The topics contained in this publication compare with data collected in March and April 1996. Where applicable, the data have been included in this publication for comparison purposes.

## RELIABILITY OF ESTIMATES

- 6** The two types of error possible in an estimate based on a sample survey are:
- Non-sampling error which arises from inaccuracies in collecting, recording and processing the data. The most significant of these errors are:
    - ◆ misreporting of data items
    - ◆ deficiencies in coverage
    - ◆ non-response
    - ◆ processing errors

Every effort is made to minimise these errors by the careful design of questionnaires, intensive training and supervision of interviewers and efficient data processing procedures.

- Sampling error which occurs because a sample, rather than the entire population is surveyed. One measure of the likely difference resulting from not including all persons in the survey is given by the standard error (please consult the Technical Notes).

## RELATED PUBLICATIONS

- 7** Users may also wish to refer to the following publication:

*Environmental Issues: People's Views and Practices*

(Cat. no. 4602.0)— 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998 and 1999 issues.

Current publications produced by the ABS are listed in the *Catalogue of Publications and Products* (Cat. no. 1101.0). The ABS also issues, on Tuesdays and Fridays, a *Release Advice* (Cat. no. 1105.0) which lists publications to be released in the next few days. The Catalogue and the Release Advice are available from any ABS office.

## TECHNICAL NOTES.....

### SAMPLING VARIABILITY

**1** As the estimates in this publication are based on information obtained from occupants of a sample of dwellings they are subject to sampling variability, that is, the estimates may differ from those that would have been produced if all dwellings had been included in the survey. One measure of the likely difference is given by the standard errors (SEs) (see tables T1 and T2), which estimate the extent to which an estimate might have varied by chance because only a sample of dwellings was included. There are about two chances in three (67%) that a sample estimate will vary by less than one SE from the number that would have been obtained if all dwellings had been included, and about 19 chances in 20 (95%) that the difference will be less than two SEs.

**2** Another measure of the likely difference is the relative standard error (RSE), which is obtained by expressing the SE as a percentage of the estimate. The RSE is a useful measure in that it provides an immediate indication of the percentage of error likely to have occurred due to sampling.

**3** As the tables of SEs show, the size of the SE increases with the size of the estimate. However, the smaller the estimate the higher the RSE. Thus, large estimates will be relatively more reliable than smaller estimates.

**4** Very small estimates are subject to large RSEs, so that their value for most practical purposes is unreliable. In the tables in this publication, only estimates with RSEs of 25% or less are considered reliable for most purposes. Estimates and percentages with RSEs between 25% and 50% are preceded by an asterisk (\*) to indicate that they are subject to high SEs and should be used with caution.

**5** This publication contains estimates for households and persons. Table T1 gives SEs for estimates of households, while SEs for estimates of persons are presented in T2. Tables containing estimates of households are found in Chapters 1 and 2, while Chapter 3 contains estimates of persons.

### CALCULATION OF STANDARD ERROR

**6** An example of the calculation and use of SEs in relation to household estimates in this publication is as follows. Table 1.1 shows that the estimated number of households in NSW who recycle plastic bags is 1 939 200. Since this estimate is between 1 000 000 and 2 000 000, table T1 shows that the SE for NSW will be between 19 150 and 21 850, and can be approximated by interpolation using the following general formula:

SE of estimate = lower bound for SE + ((size of estimate – lower bound for estimate) / (upper bound for estimate – lower bound for estimate)) x (upper bound for SE – lower bound for SE)

$$= 19\ 150 + ((1\ 939\ 200 - 1\ 000\ 000) / (2\ 000\ 000 - 1\ 000\ 000)) \times (21\ 850 - 19\ 150)$$

$$= 21\ 700 \text{ (rounded to the nearest 100)}$$

**7** Therefore, there are about two chances in three that the value which would have been produced if all dwellings had been included in the survey will fall in the range 1 917 500 to 1 960 900 and about 19 in 20 chances that the value will fall within the range 1 895 800 to 1 982 600.

**8** Similarly, SEs are calculated for person level estimates using table T2 instead of table T1. For example, table 3.1 shows that the estimated number of persons in NSW who travel to work or study is 2 932 600. This estimate is between 2 000 000 and 5 000 000, so the SE for this estimate will be between 50 150 and 76 600, and can be approximated using the same interpolation formula as above, with the resulting SE being 58 400.

## PROPORTIONS

**9** To calculate the SE for an estimate of proportion ( $x/y$ ), the following formula is used:

$$RSE\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = \sqrt{[RSE(x)]^2 - [RSE(y)]^2}$$

When using this formula, the numerator and denominator of the proportion will be estimates over subsets of the total population. The formula is valid only when the set for the numerator is a subset of the set for the denominator.

**10** For example, in table 1.1 the estimate for the total number of households in NSW is 2 437 500. The number of households that recycle plastic bags in NSW is 1 939 200, so the proportion of households in NSW who recycle plastic bags is 1 939 200/2 437 500 or 79.6%. The SE of the total number of households in NSW may be calculated by interpolation as 22 200. To convert this to an RSE we express the SE as a percentage of the estimate, or 22 200/2 437 500=0.9%. The SE for the number of households in NSW who recycle plastic bags was calculated above as 21 700, which converted to an RSE is 21 700/1 939 200=1.1%. We may then calculate the RSE of the proportion using the formula:

$$\sqrt{1.1^2 - 0.9^2} = 0.6$$

Therefore, the SE for the proportion of households in NSW which recycle plastic bags is 0.6% of 79.6%, or 0.5 percentage points. So there are 2 chances in 3 that the proportion is between 79.1% to 80.1%, and 19 chances in 20 that the proportion is between 78.6% and 80.6%.

**11** Similarly, SEs can be calculated for person level estimates using the same formula.

## DIFFERENCES

**12** Should users wish to calculate SEs for differences then particular care should be taken when comparing figures. It is not correct to assume that an apparent difference between figures is actually significant. Such an estimate is subject to sampling error. An approximate SE of the difference between two estimates ( $x-y$ ) may be calculated by the following formula:

$$SE(x-y) = \sqrt{[SE(x)]^2 + [SE(y)]^2}$$

While this formula will only be exact for differences between separate and uncorrelated characteristics of sub-populations, it is expected to provide a good approximation for all differences likely to be of interest in this publication.

**13** The imprecision due to sampling variability, which is measured by the SE, should not be confused with inaccuracies that may occur due to imperfections in reporting by interviewers and respondents, and errors made in coding and processing data. Inaccuracies of this kind are referred to as non-sampling error, and they may occur in any enumeration whether it be a full count or a sample. Every effort is made to reduce the non-sampling error to a minimum by careful design of questionnaires, intensive training and supervision of interviewers, and efficient operating procedures.

**T1** Standard errors for tables contained in Chapters 1 and 2

Size of Estimate										RSE
	NSW	Vic.	Qld.	SA	WA	Tas.	NT	ACT	Aust.	Aust.
	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	%
100	..	..	..	..	..	80	140	100	..	..
200	..	..	..	..	..	150	200	170	..	..
300	..	..	..	240	190	200	250	220	..	..
500	..	330	380	340	300	300	330	310	..	..
700	520	440	490	430	380	370	390	380	560	80.0
1 000	680	590	640	550	500	470	450	470	690	69.0
1 500	920	810	840	710	670	600	540	590	880	58.7
2 000	1 120	1 000	1 020	850	810	710	600	680	1 040	52.0
2 500	1 300	1 150	1 200	950	950	800	650	750	1 200	48.0
3 000	1 500	1 350	1 300	1 050	1 050	900	700	850	1 300	43.3
3 500	1 650	1 500	1 450	1 150	1 150	950	750	900	1 400	40.0
4 000	1 800	1 600	1 550	1 250	1 250	1 000	750	950	1 550	38.8
5 000	2 050	1 850	1 800	1 400	1 450	1 150	850	1 050	1 750	35.0
7 000	2 550	2 300	2 150	1 700	1 750	1 300	900	1 200	2 100	30.0
10 000	3 100	2 850	2 650	2 000	2 100	1 550	1 000	1 350	2 500	25.0
15 000	3 900	3 550	3 250	2 400	2 550	1 800	1 100	1 600	3 100	20.7
20 000	4 550	4 150	3 750	2 700	2 900	1 950	1 200	1 750	3 600	18.0
30 000	5 550	5 050	4 500	3 200	3 450	2 200	1 300	1 950	4 450	14.8
40 000	6 400	5 750	5 150	3 550	3 850	2 400	1 350	2 100	5 100	12.8
50 000	7 050	6 300	5 650	3 850	4 200	2 500	1 400	2 200	5 700	11.4
100 000	9 450	8 250	7 350	4 750	5 250	2 900	..	2 500	7 900	7.9
150 000	11 050	9 450	8 450	5 300	5 850	3 050	..	..	9 550	6.4
200 000	12 200	10 300	9 250	5 700	6 300	..	..	..	10 900	5.5
300 000	13 950	11 500	10 450	6 250	6 800	..	..	..	13 000	4.3
500 000	16 150	12 900	11 900	6 800	7 400	..	..	..	16 200	3.2
1 000 000	19 150	14 450	13 800	7 450	7 950	..	..	..	21 600	2.2
2 000 000	21 850	15 500	15 400	..	..	..	..	..	28 400	1.4
5 000 000	24 550	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	39 950	0.8
10 000 000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	50 950	0.5

**T2** Standard errors for tables contained in Chapter 3

Size of Estimate										RSE
	NSW	Vic.	Qld.	SA	WA	Tas.	NT	ACT	Aust.	Aust.
	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	no.	%
100	520	430	400	460	320	240	270	150	200	200.0
200	710	600	560	610	450	330	360	210	300	150.0
300	860	730	680	720	540	390	420	260	370	123.3
500	1 090	940	870	880	690	490	520	340	500	100.0
700	1 270	1 100	1 020	1 010	810	560	600	400	600	85.7
1 000	1 500	1 300	1 210	1 170	960	660	690	490	730	73.0
1 500	1 810	1 580	1 470	1 370	1 160	790	820	600	920	61.3
2 000	2 060	1 810	1 680	1 540	1 330	890	920	700	1 080	54.0
2 500	2 300	2 000	1 850	1 700	1 500	1 000	1 000	800	1 250	50.0
3 000	2 500	2 200	2 050	1 800	1 600	1 050	1 100	850	1 350	45.0
3 500	2 650	2 350	2 200	1 950	1 750	1 150	1 150	950	1 500	42.9
4 000	2 850	2 500	2 350	2 050	1 850	1 200	1 200	1 000	1 600	40.0
5 000	3 150	2 800	2 600	2 250	2 050	1 350	1 350	1 150	1 800	36.0
7 000	3 700	3 300	3 050	2 550	2 400	1 550	1 550	1 350	2 200	31.4
10 000	4 350	3 900	3 600	2 950	2 850	1 800	1 800	1 600	2 650	26.5
15 000	5 250	4 750	4 400	3 500	3 450	2 150	2 100	2 000	3 350	22.3
20 000	6 000	5 450	5 050	3 900	3 950	2 450	2 350	2 350	3 950	19.8
30 000	7 200	6 600	6 100	4 600	4 800	2 950	2 800	2 850	4 950	16.5
40 000	8 250	7 550	7 000	5 150	5 450	3 300	3 150	3 350	5 800	14.5
50 000	9 150	8 400	7 800	5 650	6 100	3 650	3 450	3 750	6 600	13.2
100 000	12 550	11 700	10 850	7 500	8 450	4 950	4 600	5 400	9 700	9.7
150 000	15 150	14 200	13 150	8 800	10 200	5 900	5 450	6 650	12 200	8.1
200 000	17 300	16 300	15 100	9 900	11 700	6 700	6 100	7 750	14 350	7.2
300 000	20 900	19 750	18 300	11 650	14 200	8 000	7 200	9 550	18 000	6.0
500 000	26 450	25 200	23 300	14 300	18 050	10 050	8 900	12 500	24 000	4.8
1 000 000	36 450	35 100	32 450	18 950	25 050	13 600	11 850	17 950	35 400	3.5
2 000 000	50 150	48 850	45 150	25 050	34 750	18 400	15 750	25 750	52 200	2.6
5 000 000	76 600	75 600	69 800	36 250	53 600	27 500	23 000	41 550	87 350	1.7
10 000 000	105 550	105 250	97 100	47 950	74 350	37 250	30 600	59 700	128 900	1.3

## FOR MORE INFORMATION...

- INTERNET* **www.abs.gov.au** the ABS web site is the best place to start for access to summary data from our latest publications, information about the ABS, advice about upcoming releases, our catalogue, and Australia Now—a statistical profile.
- LIBRARY* A range of ABS publications is available from public and tertiary libraries Australia-wide. Contact your nearest library to determine whether it has the ABS statistics you require, or visit our web site for a list of libraries.
- CPI INFOLINE* For current and historical Consumer Price Index data, call 1902 981 074 (call cost 77c per minute).
- DIAL-A-STATISTIC* For the latest figures for National Accounts, Balance of Payments, Labour Force, Average Weekly Earnings, Estimated Resident Population and the Consumer Price Index call 1900 986 400 (call cost 77c per minute).

**INFORMATION SERVICE**

Data which have been published and can be provided within five minutes are free of charge. Our information consultants can also help you to access the full range of ABS information—ABS user-pays services can be tailored to your needs, time frame and budget. Publications may be purchased. Specialists are on hand to help you with analytical or methodological advice.

- PHONE* **1300 135 070**
- EMAIL* **client.services@abs.gov.au**
- FAX* 1300 135 211
- POST* Client Services, ABS, GPO Box 796, Sydney 1041

## WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE?

ABS subscription services provide regular, convenient and prompt deliveries of ABS publications and products as they are released. Email delivery of monthly and quarterly publications is available.

- PHONE* 1300 366 323
- EMAIL* subscriptions@abs.gov.au
- FAX* 03 9615 7848
- POST* Subscription Services, ABS, GPO Box 2796Y, Melbourne 3001



2460200003009  
ISSN 1324-9029

RRP \$21.00

© Commonwealth of Australia 2000