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Accessibility is the ease and feasibility of reaching valued destinations. It can be measured for a wide array of transportation modes, to different types of destinations, and at different times of day. There are a variety of ways to define accessibility, but the number of destinations reachable within a given travel time is the most comprehensible and transparent as well as the most directly comparable across cities.

This study estimates the accessibility to jobs by transit and walking for each of the United States’ 11 million census blocks and analyzes these data in 49 of the 50 largest (by population) metropolitan areas. Transit is used for an estimated 5 percent of commuting trips in the United States, making it the second most widely used commute mode after driving. Travel times by transit are calculated using detailed pedestrian networks and full transit schedules for the 7:00 – 9:00 a.m. period. The calculations include all components of a transit journey, including “last-mile” access and egress walking segments and transfers, and account for minute-by-minute variations in service frequency.

This report presents detailed accessibility values for each metropolitan area, as well as block-level maps which illustrate the spatial patterns of accessibility within each area.
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Executive Summary

Accessibility is the ease and feasibility of reaching valuable destinations. Accessibility can be measured for a wide array of transportation modes, to different types of destinations, and at different times of day. There are a variety of ways to define accessibility, but the number of destinations reachable within a given travel time is the most comprehensible and transparent—as well as the most directly comparable between cities, and other geographic areas. This report focuses on accessibility to jobs by transit. Jobs are the most significant non-home destination, and job accessibility is an important consideration in the attractiveness and usefulness of a place or area. Transit is used for an estimated 5% of commuting trips in the United States nationwide, making it the second most widely used commute mode after driving.

This study estimates the accessibility to jobs by transit and walking for each of the United States’ 11 million census blocks, and analyzes these data in the 50 largest (by population) metropolitan areas. Travel times by transit are calculated using detailed pedestrian networks and full transit schedules for the 7:00 – 9:00 AM period. The calculations include all components of a transit journey, including “last mile” access and egress walking segments and transfers, and account for minute-by-minute variations in service frequency.

Rankings are determined by a weighted average of accessibility, with a higher weight given to closer, easier to access jobs. Jobs reachable within ten minutes are weighted most heavily, and jobs are given decreasing weights as travel time increases up to 60 minutes. Based on this measure, the 10 metropolitan areas with the greatest accessibility to jobs by transit are:

1. New York
2. San Francisco
3. Chicago
4. Washington, D.C.
5. Los Angeles
6. Boston
7. Philadelphia
8. Seattle
9. Denver
10. San Jose

Additionally, rankings based on 1-year changes in weighted average accessibility are also provided, comparing the results of Access Across America: Transit 2019 with the results of the 2020 study. The 10 metropolitan areas with the greatest 1-year relative gains in accessibility to jobs by transit are:

1. Nashville
2. Memphis
3. Washington, D.C.
4. Austin
5. Denver
6. Virginia Beach
7. Providence
8. Tampa
9. Buffalo
10. Philadelphia

This report presents detailed accessibility values for each metropolitan area, as well as block-level maps that illustrate the spatial patterns of accessibility within each area. A separate publication, *Access Across America: Transit 2020 Methodology*, describes the data and methodology used in this evaluation.

All data used in this report were collected during or before January 2020, and thus reflect conditions before the U.S. experienced significant disruption to transportation networks, travel behavior, employment, and land use during the COVID-19 pandemic. Because future editions of this report will include data reflecting conditions at various points during the pandemic, the 2020 results may provide a useful baseline for evaluating the impact that COVID-19 had on access across America.
1 Introduction

Accessibility is the ease and feasibility of reaching valuable destinations. It combines the simpler metric of mobility with the understanding that travel is driven by a desire to reach destinations. Accessibility can be measured for a wide range of transportation modes, to different types of destinations, and at different times of day. There are a variety of ways to define accessibility, but the number of destinations reachable within a given travel time is the most comprehensible and transparent—as well as the most directly comparable across cities. This report focuses on accessibility to jobs by transit. Jobs are the most significant non-home destination, and economic accessibility is an important consideration in the attractiveness and usefulness of a place or area. Transit is used for an estimated 5% of commuting trips in the United States, making it the second most widely used commute mode after driving. The commute mode share of transit can be higher in individual metropolitan areas: 31% in the New York metropolitan area; 11% in Chicago; 8% in Seattle.

Accessibility is not a new idea. Historically, however, implementations of accessibility evaluation have typically focused on individual cities or metropolitan areas. Recent work has demonstrated the feasibility and value of systematically evaluating accessibility across multiple metropolitan areas by auto, and by transit.

This study estimates the accessibility to jobs by transit and walking for each of the United States’ 11 million census blocks, and analyzes these data in the 50 largest (by population) metropolitan areas using transit schedules from 2020. Table 1 lists the included metropolitan areas, ordered by the total employment within each.

Travel times by transit are calculated using detailed pedestrian networks and full transit schedules for the 7:00 – 9:00 AM period. The calculations include all components of a transit journey, including “last mile” access and egress walking segments and transfers, and account for minute-by-minute variations in service frequency.

Section 2 presents the accessibility values for the included metropolitan areas and ranks metropolitan areas by accessibility. Section 3 discusses these results and their implications, and Section 4 provides data and maps describing patterns of accessibility in individual metropolitan areas. A separate document, Access Across America: Transit 2020 Methodology, describes the data and detailed methodology used in the evaluation.

---

1 McKenzie (2014)
2 See Hansen (1959) for its origins, and Geurs and Van Eck (2001) and Handy and Niemeier (1997) for reviews.
3 Levinson (2013) Levine et al. (2012)
4 Ramsey and Bell (2014), Tömer et al. (2011)
Table 1: Metropolitan Areas Ranked by Total Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9,123,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,940,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4,511,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>3,460,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>2,969,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2,917,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2,910,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>2,613,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>2,547,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2,510,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>2,304,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>2,031,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1,948,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,875,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1,864,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,810,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1,457,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,455,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1,352,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>1,339,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1,331,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>1,180,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,172,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1,124,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1,068,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,061,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1,052,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>1,008,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>997,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>979,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>979,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>976,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>964,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>961,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>938,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>871,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>790,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>789,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>732,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>684,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>655,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>653,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>635,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>624,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>600,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>599,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>581,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>539,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>515,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>492,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.
2 Accessibility to Jobs by Transit

Table 2 gives the accessibility values for each metropolitan area, in alphabetical order, based on January, 2020 transit schedules. The columns represent the number of jobs that a typical worker residing in the city can reach within 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, and 60 minutes of travel, between 7:00 and 9:00 AM, by transit and walking.
Table 2: Number of Jobs Reachable by Number of Minutes, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>10 min</th>
<th>20 min</th>
<th>30 min</th>
<th>40 min</th>
<th>50 min</th>
<th>60 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>19,875</td>
<td>40,272</td>
<td>69,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>12,931</td>
<td>30,997</td>
<td>56,799</td>
<td>87,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>17,549</td>
<td>38,901</td>
<td>70,795</td>
<td>111,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>10,090</td>
<td>15,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>12,098</td>
<td>42,813</td>
<td>99,446</td>
<td>180,911</td>
<td>272,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>12,215</td>
<td>27,514</td>
<td>49,167</td>
<td>74,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>7,057</td>
<td>17,283</td>
<td>34,076</td>
<td>57,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>16,656</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>129,976</td>
<td>235,852</td>
<td>357,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>16,539</td>
<td>30,922</td>
<td>49,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>8,488</td>
<td>22,001</td>
<td>44,019</td>
<td>73,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>10,520</td>
<td>24,989</td>
<td>47,687</td>
<td>78,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>11,025</td>
<td>27,708</td>
<td>57,412</td>
<td>103,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>6,536</td>
<td>21,841</td>
<td>53,599</td>
<td>111,262</td>
<td>198,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>15,792</td>
<td>33,321</td>
<td>61,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td>22,874</td>
<td>40,399</td>
<td>63,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>13,025</td>
<td>32,680</td>
<td>65,337</td>
<td>112,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>18,253</td>
<td>34,312</td>
<td>55,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>10,282</td>
<td>21,019</td>
<td>36,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td>16,678</td>
<td>30,862</td>
<td>49,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>9,251</td>
<td>27,046</td>
<td>62,917</td>
<td>120,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>38,115</td>
<td>97,947</td>
<td>201,404</td>
<td>356,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>7,182</td>
<td>17,484</td>
<td>33,038</td>
<td>53,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>14,207</td>
<td>27,075</td>
<td>44,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>12,526</td>
<td>28,968</td>
<td>55,945</td>
<td>95,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>18,404</td>
<td>45,669</td>
<td>85,910</td>
<td>135,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>18,903</td>
<td>48,183</td>
<td>93,022</td>
<td>150,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>16,202</td>
<td>28,438</td>
<td>43,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>21,985</td>
<td>35,919</td>
<td>50,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>62,324</td>
<td>217,386</td>
<td>487,972</td>
<td>878,701</td>
<td>1,349,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>10,713</td>
<td>20,203</td>
<td>32,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>13,394</td>
<td>27,473</td>
<td>49,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>11,455</td>
<td>40,063</td>
<td>83,877</td>
<td>143,067</td>
<td>215,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>11,057</td>
<td>30,397</td>
<td>65,418</td>
<td>118,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>12,861</td>
<td>30,255</td>
<td>53,318</td>
<td>80,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>5,841</td>
<td>20,796</td>
<td>51,355</td>
<td>98,779</td>
<td>160,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>20,769</td>
<td>35,906</td>
<td>54,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>11,195</td>
<td>21,918</td>
<td>37,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>7,262</td>
<td>11,639</td>
<td>16,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>12,751</td>
<td>25,339</td>
<td>43,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>21,511</td>
<td>42,653</td>
<td>73,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>15,741</td>
<td>42,246</td>
<td>89,363</td>
<td>159,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>9,019</td>
<td>23,771</td>
<td>48,491</td>
<td>84,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>11,876</td>
<td>30,283</td>
<td>64,025</td>
<td>115,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>25,521</td>
<td>79,429</td>
<td>166,523</td>
<td>286,212</td>
<td>428,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>19,951</td>
<td>54,224</td>
<td>117,336</td>
<td>213,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>30,915</td>
<td>68,101</td>
<td>120,361</td>
<td>186,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>16,962</td>
<td>34,352</td>
<td>58,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>18,496</td>
<td>36,438</td>
<td>61,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>11,349</td>
<td>21,559</td>
<td>35,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>10,727</td>
<td>43,339</td>
<td>104,120</td>
<td>194,905</td>
<td>310,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Metropolitan Area Rankings

The rankings of accessibility across U.S. cities for 2020 are shown in Table 3. The ranking is based on a weighted average, where the jobs reachable within each threshold are given a decreasing weight as travel time increases. A job reachable within 10 minutes counts more toward the ranking than a job reachable within 20, and so on. The 10 metro areas where workers can, on average, reach the most jobs are listed below. Within the specific time thresholds, the rankings vary.

1. New York
2. San Francisco
3. Chicago
4. Washington, D.C.
5. Los Angeles
6. Boston
7. Philadelphia
8. Seattle
9. Denver
10. San Jose
Table 3: Rank of Accessibility by Metropolitan Area, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>10 min</th>
<th>20 min</th>
<th>30 min</th>
<th>40 min</th>
<th>50 min</th>
<th>60 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Annual Accessibility Change

The 1-year relative gains and losses of weighted transit accessibility across U.S. cities between 2019 and 2020 are shown in Table 4. The differences detailed here are relative percentage changes in weighted accessibility. Additional details about each metropolitan area, including block-level maps of accessibility, are presented in Section 4. The 10 metro areas where workers experiences the greatest increase in transit access are listed below.

1. Nashville
2. Memphis
3. Washington, D.C.
4. Austin
5. Denver
6. Virginia Beach
7. Providence
8. Tampa
9. Buffalo
10. Philadelphia
Table 4: 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility, 2020 vs. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>+27.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>+26.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>+14.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>+11.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>+9.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>+6.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>+5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>+5.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>+4.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>+4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>+3.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>+3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>+3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>+3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>+3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>+3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>+2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>+2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>+2.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>+2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>+2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>+2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>+2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>+2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>+1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>+1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>+1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>+1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>+1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>+1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>+1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>+0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>+0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>+0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>+0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>-1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>-1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>-1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>-2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>-2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>-3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>-5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>-5.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>-5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>-5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>-10.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>-19.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-44.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Discussion

This report is a companion to the work in reports Access Across America: Bike 2020 and Access Across America: Auto 2020. Accessibility data are calculated for every Census block in the U.S.; data are aggregated and summarized within core-based statistical areas (CBSAs) for this report.

Not all jobs are the same. Some jobs are higher paying, some are lower skilled, and they exist in a variety of industries. Given sufficient data, one could differentiate accessibility by breaking down jobs by type and get different results. Accessibility to non-work locations (shopping, health care, education, etc.) is also important. Regardless of trip purpose, people who experience higher accessibility tend to travel shorter distances because origins and destinations are closer together.

But accessibility to jobs is not the only thing that people care about. If it were, cities would be situated on a minimum amount of space so people could live immediately adjacent to their jobs, or everyone would work from home. Measuring (and then valuing) accessibility to other opportunities and considering the trade-off between accessibility and living space are central problems of urban economics, regional science, and transportation and land use planning. While being more accessible is generally better, there are costs as well as benefits associated with accessibility. If land is more valuable, its price is higher, and purchasers can afford less. Streets in places with more activities are inherently more crowded, and trips are less peaceful.

Accessibility is a function of both transportation networks and land use decisions, which has important policy implications. There are two broad avenues to increasing accessibility: improving transportation systems, and altering land use patterns. Neither of these things can be easily shifted overnight, but over time they do change—both through direct plans and action and through market forces.

It is important to recognize that aggregate metrics such as these are also affected simply by the size of the areas being studied. For example, residents of central Minneapolis enjoy greater accessibility than those of central Milwaukee, but the expansive Minneapolis–Saint Paul metropolitan area, which is over four times as large in land area, includes far more suburban and exurban areas (with little or no transit service) than does the Milwaukee area.

3.1 Transit Service Effects

Transit transportation improvements within existing infrastructure take the form of speed increases or frequency increases. Speed improvements increase accessibility by making destinations reachable in less time, but they are often difficult to achieve for transit vehicles operating in mixed traffic. Frequency improvements reduce the average amount of time spent waiting for transit vehicles at stops, leaving more time for travel toward valuable destinations. Speed and frequency are also linked: as average speeds increase, a fixed number of transit vehicles can serve the same route length with increasing frequency.⁵ Improvements involving construction of new transit infrastructure (additional bus stops, rail line extensions, or entirely new transit lines) also can heavily influence accessibility by transit, by providing transit-based access to job centers and destinations previously unreachable. New transit lines which serve already-served areas do not expand the set of reachable valuable destinations, but could serve to increase service frequency in aggregate.

---

⁵Walker (2012) provides a detailed and accessible exploration of transit service fundamentals.
This evaluation reflects the impact of transit service frequency by making the assumption that all departure times are equally valuable to users, and it includes full waiting times before each trip. This is an important difference relative to earlier national evaluations of transit accessibility, which typically use a single departure time and/or a fixed wait time. This approach provides two important benefits. First, it avoids the assumptions that transit service with 30-minute frequency is as valuable as service with 10-minute frequency, and that users suffer no inconvenience from adjusting their personal schedules to match transit schedules. Second, it allows more meaningful comparisons with accessibility evaluations for other transportation modes such as driving, which typically use average speeds over time periods—implicitly assuming an equal value of departure times. As a result of this methodological choice, the accessibility results presented here are far more sensitive to service frequency effects than those of many other transit accessibility evaluations. Cities with robust transit coverage but low service frequency are generally ranked lower than cities with comparable networks but higher frequencies.

### 3.2 Land Use Effects

Land use-based approaches to improving transit accessibility revolve around proximity and density for both origins and destinations. Proximity to transit service is critical in overcoming both the low speed of pedestrian access to and from stops and stations, and the decrease in motivation to make the walking trip with greater distance. Density is the manifestation of the increasing value of more accessible locations. As residential areas become denser, more residents experience the local accessibility; as employment areas become denser, more jobs can be accessed through the same transit system.

At lower accessibility thresholds, and especially at the 10-minute threshold, the job accessibility experienced by a typical worker is determined primarily by local employment density and only secondarily, if at all, by transit service. With a 10-minute travel time budget, reaching a stop, waiting for a vehicle, and walking to the destination after alighting leave little time available for actually traveling on a transit vehicle. It is likely that most jobs within this threshold are reached solely by walking and do not involve a transit vehicle at all. The results presented in Table 3 for the 10-minute threshold look much like a ranking by employment and residential density. As the travel time threshold increases, so does the relative contribution of transit service and coverage to the rankings.

### 3.3 Note on COVID-19

All data used in this report were collected during or before January 2020, and thus reflect conditions before the U.S. experienced significant disruption to transportation networks, travel behavior, employment, and land use during the COVID-19 pandemic. Because future editions of this report will include data reflecting conditions at various points during the pandemic, the 2020 results may provide a useful baseline for evaluating the impact that COVID-19 had on access across America.

---

6 e.g. Tomer et al. (2011), Ramsey and Bell (2014)
7 e.g. Levinson (2013), Levine et al. (2012)
3.4 Conclusions

The cities that make up the top 10 transit accessibility ranks all exhibit a combination of high density land use and fast, frequent transit service. However, there is still significant variation within this group. In New York, San Francisco, Washington, and Chicago, fast heavy rail systems connect both urban and suburban areas with a highly employment-dense core. It is instructive to compare these cities to Atlanta, which has a similar, but smaller, rail system but a much more decentralized job and population distribution, and lower accessibility. Seattle and Denver both have rapidly expanding light rail systems, supported by extensive and frequent bus networks. Though Portland is famous for its streetcar service, this covers only a small part of the city, and operates mostly in mixed traffic with very little access to proprietary right-of-way, limiting its service speed. Its urban growth boundary, combined with frequent bus service throughout core areas and light rail connections to suburban areas, also plays an important role in providing high accessibility: by encouraging both residents and employers to locate in parts of the city already well served by transit, each new resident enjoys high accessibility but imposes only a small marginal burden on the transit system’s existing resources.

Additionally, the scope of this report’s focus toward analyzing accessibility for every census block in the U.S. affords a look at what impact public transit has on a national scale. The vast majority of the U.S. land mass is quite sparsely-populated outside of metropolitan areas, and the contained metropolitan areas are in many cases very far apart. Also, the type of transit service included in the analysis is strictly limited to public transit, most commonly found in urban areas—inter-city bus and rail services, such as Megabus, Greyhound, or Jefferson, and Amtrak, respectively, are not included. Further, such services operate on time-scales greater than the travel times involved in this analysis. Given that mostly urban-centric systems are included, only a very small geographical area of the country enjoys mass transit services, and thus the total area experiencing transit accessibility benefits is quite small.

Transportation and land use systems are both dynamic, and this report presents only a single snapshot in time. In constantly evolving systems like these, it is critical to monitor changes over time. A city that adopts a goal of increasing transit accessibility can be evaluated based on how effectively it advances that goal relative to a baseline.
4 Metropolitan Area Data and Maps

The following pages present summary accessibility data and maps for each of the 50 included metropolitan areas. Metropolitan areas are presented in alphabetical order. The maps show 30-minute accessibility values at the Census block level, averaged between 7:00 and 9:00 AM. On the data summary pages, two different chart scales are used to accommodate the wide range of accessibility values across metropolitan areas. All charts using the same scale are plotted in the same color.
Atlanta
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility: 32
Rank by Total Employment: 8
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019): 34 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019): +0.14%
Total Jobs: 2,724,668
Average Job Density (per km$^2$): 126
Total Workers: 2,613,224
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$): 121

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Austin
Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  20
Rank by Total Employment  28
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  4 (+3)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +11.82%
Total Jobs  1,058,473
Average Job Density (per km²)  97
Total Workers  1,008,525
Average Worker Density (per km²)  92

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.
### Baltimore

Baltimore-Towson, MD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>31 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,354,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>1,331,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

#### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing job accessibility by travel time threshold](image)

#### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing 1-year change in weighted accessibility by travel time threshold](image)
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Birmingham
Birmingham-Hoover, AL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>45 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-5.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>526,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>492,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>5,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>10,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>15,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>-454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>-1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>-1,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Boston**  
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>17 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>2,735,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>2,510,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>12,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>42,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>99,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>180,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>272,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+1,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+4,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+6,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Buffalo
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>9 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+4.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>560,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>539,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Charlotte
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>39 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,068,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>961,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
## Chicago
Chicago-Joliet-Naperville, IL-IN-WI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>22 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>4,620,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>4,511,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Job Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>1,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>16,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>56,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>129,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>235,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>357,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change in Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+1,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+2,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+6,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cincinnati
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>24 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,070,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>1,061,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold](image)

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold](image)
Cleveland
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>26 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,042,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>979,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>2,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>8,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>22,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>44,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>73,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>1-Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+1,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Columbus**

Columbus, OH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>38 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,045,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km$^2$)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>964,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km$^2$)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

![Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold Graph]

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

![1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold Graph]
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Dallas
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>40 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>3,638,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>3,460,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Denver
Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 9
Rank by Total Employment 17
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 5 (+1)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +9.11%
Total Jobs 1,519,011
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 70
Total Workers 1,457,784
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 67

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Detroit
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  38
Rank by Total Employment  13
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  41 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  -2.24%
Total Jobs  1,963,432
Average Job Density (per km²)  195
Total Workers  1,948,016
Average Worker Density (per km²)  193

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Hartford
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 27
Rank by Total Employment 46
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 46 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) -5.78%
Total Jobs 639,259
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 163
Total Workers 599,797
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 153

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
**Houston**  
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>20 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>3,050,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>2,969,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

![Graph showing job accessibility by travel time threshold](image1)

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

![Graph showing 1-year change in accessibility by travel time threshold](image2)
Indianapolis
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  34
Rank by Total Employment  35
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  15 (+2)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +3.03%
Total Jobs  1,034,440
Average Job Density (per km²)  104
Total Workers  938,926
Average Worker Density (per km²)  94

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
**Jacksonville**
Jacksonville, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>14 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>713,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>684,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Job Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>4,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>10,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>21,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>36,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change in Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+1,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kansas City
Kansas City, MO-KS

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  40
Rank by Total Employment  25
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  13 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +3.23%
Total Jobs  1,092,061
Average Job Density (per km$^2$)  54
Total Workers  1,068,380
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$)  53

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Las Vegas
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>36 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>992,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>979,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Job Accessibility Graph](image)

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![1-Year Change Graph](image)
Los Angeles
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  5
Rank by Total Employment  2
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  47 (-1)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  -5.84%
Total Jobs  6,375,672
Average Job Density (per km$^2$)  508
Total Workers  5,940,045
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$)  473

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
**Louisville**
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>37 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>678,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km$^2$)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>655,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km$^2$)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**
Louisville
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN
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State border
CBSA boundary
Memphis
Memphis, TN-MS-AR

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 43
Rank by Total Employment 45
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 2 (+3)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +26.69%
Total Jobs 624,288
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 53
Total Workers 600,816
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 51

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Miami
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL

| Rank by Weighted Accessibility | 19 |
| Rank by Total Employment       | 9  |
| Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | 49 (-3) |
| Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)   | -19.95% |
| Total Jobs                      | 2,609,371 |
| Average Job Density (per km²)   | 198 |
| Total Workers                   | 2,547,894 |
| Average Worker Density (per km²) | 194 |

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*
**Milwaukee**
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>42 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>868,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>789,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing job accessibility by travel time threshold](image)

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing change in accessibility by travel time threshold](image)
 Milwaukee
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI

Jobs within 30 minutes
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State border
CBSA boundary
Minneapolis
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI

| Rank by Weighted Accessibility | 12 |
| Rank by Total Employment | 14 |
| Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | 18 (0) |
| Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | +2.47% |
| Total Jobs | 1,935,731 |
| Average Job Density (per km²) | 124 |
| Total Workers | 1,875,283 |
| Average Worker Density (per km²) | 120 |

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
### Nashville
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>1 (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+27.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>960,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>871,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

#### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>7,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>16,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>28,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>43,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>+58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+5,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+8,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nashville
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN
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2,500,000 - 5,000,000
5,000,000 - 7,500,000
7,500,000 - 10,000,000
10,000,000 +

State border
CBSA boundary
New Orleans
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  30
Rank by Total Employment  49
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  19 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +2.28%
Total Jobs  544,627
Average Job Density (per km²)  71
Total Workers  515,490
Average Worker Density (per km²)  67

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
New Orleans
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA
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State border
CBSA boundary
New York
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 1
Rank by Total Employment 1
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 27 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +1.87%
Total Jobs 9,345,410
Average Job Density (per km²) 540
Total Workers 9,123,803
Average Worker Density (per km²) 527

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
New York
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA
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State border
CBSA boundary
**Oklahoma City**
Oklahoma City, OK

- Rank by Weighted Accessibility: 47
- Rank by Total Employment: 47
- Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019): 21 (+1)
- Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019): +2.24%
- Total Jobs: 618,807
- Average Job Density (per km²): 43
- Total Workers: 581,135
- Average Worker Density (per km²): 41

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*
Orlando
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 42
Rank by Total Employment 22
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 33 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +0.87%
Total Jobs 1,318,766
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 146
Total Workers 1,180,122
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 131

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold (min)</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>13,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>27,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>49,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold (min)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>+450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>+556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philadelphia
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>2,897,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>2,917,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Phoenix
Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +3.57%

Total Jobs: 2,087,440
Average Job Density (per km²): 55
Total Workers: 2,031,682
Average Worker Density (per km²): 54

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Job Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>11,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>30,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>65,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>118,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change in Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+1,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+2,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+3,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 23
Rank by Total Employment 24
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 28 (-1)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +1.82%
Total Jobs 1,160,304
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 85
Total Workers 1,124,645
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 82

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Portland
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 11
Rank by Total Employment 23
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 23 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +2.14%
Total Jobs 1,200,681
Average Job Density (per km$^2$) 69
Total Workers 1,172,726
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$) 68

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
## Providence
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>704,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>790,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing job accessibility by travel time threshold](image)

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing 1-year change in weighted accessibility by travel time threshold](image)
Raleigh
Raleigh-Cary, NC

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  46
Rank by Total Employment  43
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  35 (-1)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +0.05%
Total Jobs  701,217
Average Job Density (per km$^2$)  128
Total Workers  635,452
Average Worker Density (per km$^2$)  116

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*
Richmond
Richmond, VA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 49
Rank by Total Employment 42
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 50 (-8)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) -44.30%
Total Jobs 676,685
Average Job Density (per km²) 46
Total Workers 653,717
Average Worker Density (per km²) 44

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Riverside
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA

Riverside
Rank by Weighted Accessibility 44
Rank by Total Employment 16
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 16 (-1)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +3.01%
Total Jobs 1,494,261
Average Job Density (per km²) 21
Total Workers 1,810,387
Average Worker Density (per km²) 26

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
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Sacramento
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville, CA

| Rank by Weighted Accessibility | 28 |
| Rank by Total Employment       | 29 |
| Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | 43 (0) |
| Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  | -3.71% |
| Total Jobs                     | 978,179 |
| Average Job Density (per km²)  | 74  |
| Total Workers                  | 997,286 |
| Average Worker Density (per km²)| 76  |

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
Sacramento
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA
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State border
CBSA boundary
Salt Lake City
Salt Lake City, UT

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 14
Rank by Total Employment 44
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 11 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +3.88%
Total Jobs 740,560
Average Job Density (per km²) 30
Total Workers 624,753
Average Worker Density (per km²) 25

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
San Antonio
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>44 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>-5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,017,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>1,052,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km(^2))</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing job accessibility by travel time threshold]

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Graph showing 1-year change in weighted accessibility by travel time threshold]
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State border
CBSA boundary
San Diego
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 17
Rank by Total Employment 18
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 32 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +0.95%
Total Jobs 1,439,958
Total Workers 1,455,825
Average Job Density (per km²) 132
Average Worker Density (per km²) 134

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
San Francisco
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>30 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>2,479,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>2,304,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*
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State border
CBSA boundary
San Jose
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>25 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,112,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>976,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

### Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold Graph](image)

### 1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

![1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold Graph](image)
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State border
CBSA boundary
Seattle
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA

Rank by Weighted Accessibility  8
Rank by Total Employment  15
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  29 (0)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)  +1.58%
Total Jobs  1,995,318
Average Job Density (per km²)  131
Total Workers  1,864,758
Average Worker Density (per km²)  123

Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.

Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold

1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold
St. Louis
St. Louis, MO-IL

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 37
Rank by Total Employment 19
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 48 (-4)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) -10.07%
Total Jobs 1,373,473
Average Job Density (per km²) 61
Total Workers 1,352,325
Average Worker Density (per km²) 61

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

105
Tampa
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Weighted Accessibility</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Total Employment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>8 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019)</td>
<td>+5.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>1,360,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Density (per km²)</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>1,339,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Worker Density (per km²)</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Job Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>7,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>18,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>36,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>61,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Threshold</th>
<th>Change in Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>+113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>+482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>+1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>+2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>+3,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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State border
CBSA boundary
Virginia Beach
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC

Rank by Weighted Accessibility 45
Rank by Total Employment 39
Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) 6 (+2)
Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) +6.89%
Total Jobs 728,311
Average Job Density (per km²) 107
Total Workers 732,191
Average Worker Density (per km²) 108

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*
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State border
CBSA boundary
**Washington**
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV

| Rank by Weighted Accessibility | 4 |
| Rank by Total Employment        | 7 |
| Rank by Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | 3 (+2) |
| Change in Accessibility (vs. 2019) | +14.65% |
| Total Jobs                      | 3,087,681 |
| Average Job Density (per km²)   | 213 |
| Total Workers                   | 2,910,113 |
| Average Worker Density (per km²) | 201 |

*Job and worker totals are based on LEHD estimates and may not match other sources.*

**Job Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**

**1-Year Change in Weighted Accessibility by Travel Time Threshold**


