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Research Background

## Commuting Trends

- Increase of extreme commuters - the 2000 Census identified about 3.5 million extreme commuters, doubled the number in 1990 (Lang \& Nelson, 2007).
- Increase of inter-metropolitan commuting from 1980 to 2000 inter-metropolitan commuting increased $28 \%$, more than doubled the growth rate of the overall commuting (Pisarski, 2006).


## Metropolitan Networks



Source: http://www.america2050.org/maps/

## Define Interregional Long Distance Commuting

- At lease 50 miles one-way
- Cross the boundary of a metropolitan region


## Commuting Cases

- Scott - commutes between Austin and Hallettsville daily, 2-hour drive;
- Brandy - commutes between Austin and Houston weekly, 3-hour drive;
- Lisa - commutes between Austin and Dallas bi-weekly, 3.5-hour drive;
- Lester - commutes between Dallas and Houston weekly, 4-hour drive, sometimes takes flight.


## What the NHTS Tells Us?

# National Long Distance Commuting (Reported Distance to Work >=50 miles) 

## Long-Distance Commuting Share

- Total workers increased 4\% from 2001 to 2009.
- Long distance commuter: 2.8\% (2001 NHTS); 2.9\% (2009 NHTS);

| Year | Northeast | Midwest | South | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2001 | $3.1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2009 | $2.9 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |

## Long-Distance Commute Composition

- 2001 NHTS

| Distance <br> (Miles) | Northeast | Midwest | South | West | Nation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 1 0 0}$ | $87.17 \%$ | $92.17 \%$ | $78.17 \%$ | $91.91 \%$ | $85.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 3 0 0}$ | $12.59 \%$ | $6.68 \%$ | $17.12 \%$ | $5.72 \%$ | $11.52 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{> 3 0 0}$ | $0.24 \%$ | $1.15 \%$ | $4.72 \%$ | $2.37 \%$ | $2.58 \%$ |

- 2009 NHTS

| Distance <br> (Miles) | Northeast | Midwest | South | West | Nation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 1 0 0}$ | $86.61 \%$ | $91.09 \%$ | $84.12 \%$ | $88.30 \%$ | $86.98 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 - 3 0 0}$ | $12.78 \%$ | $6.44 \%$ | $13.42 \%$ | $8.38 \%$ | $10.73 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{> 3 0 0}$ | $0.61 \%$ | $2.48 \%$ | $2.46 \%$ | $3.32 \%$ | $2.29 \%$ |

## Mode Share \& Commute Schedule

- Mode share Year

Auto mode share Drive alone share

| 2001 | $91.3 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2009 | $91.5 \%$ | $83.0 \%$ |

- Commute schedule

| Year | Commuting Distance | Leave home before <br> 7am | Return home after <br> 6pm |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $<50$ miles | $29.2 \%$ | $37.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $>=50$ miles | $56.4 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |
|  | $<50$ miles | $28.9 \%$ | $36.2 \%$ |
|  | $>=50$ miles | $56.0 \%$ | $59.6 \%$ |

## VMT

- VMT for long distance commuting: 16\% (2001 NHTS); 13\% (2009 NHTS);

| Region | VMT for commuting (billion miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ |  |  | 2009 |  |  |  |
|  | All | $<50$ miles | $>=50$ miles | All | $<50$ miles | $>=50$ miles |  |
| Northeast | 106.9 | 91.4 | 15.4 | 112.4 | 96.9 | 15.6 |  |
| Midwest | 154.1 | 137.6 | 16.5 | 147.8 | 130.8 | 17.0 |  |
| South | 259.7 | 211.4 | 48.3 | 264.3 | 227.4 | 36.9 |  |
| West | 146.6 | 121.6 | 25.0 | 142.5 | 122.7 | 19.8 |  |
| Total | 667.3 | 562.0 | 105.3 | 667.0 | 577.8 | 89.2 |  |

## Factors affect Long-Distance Commuting Decision

- Individual characteristics - Gender, Age
- Socioeconomic status - Income, Education, Occupation
- Household component - Marriage status, Children, Spouse
- Job/Housing market - Residence location, Housing tenure, Company policy
- Transportation \& Communication Technology - Travel mode options, Internet use
- Preference \& Social tie


## Binary Models

| Variable | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTTOWK>=50 } \\ & \text { (2001) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTTOWK>=100 } \\ & \text { (2001) } \end{aligned}$ | DISTTOWK>=50 (2009) | DISTTOWK>=100 (2009) |
| Gender | Male/Female |  |  |  |
| Income | $1=<\$ 25,000 ; 2=<\$ 60,000 ; 3=<\$ 100,000 ; 4=(>=100,000)$ |  |  |  |
| Education | 1=High school and 3=Bach | wer; 2=Some colleg 4=Graduate | 1=Lower than college; 3=Bachelor; 4=Graduate |  |
| Occupation | 1=Sales or service; 2=Clerical or administrative; 3=Manufacturing, construction, maintenance, or farming; 4=Professional, managerial or technical; 5=Other |  |  |  |
| Life cycle | With children under 5/Not with |  |  |  |
| Number of worker in household | 1-10 |  |  |  |
| House ownership | Own/Not own |  |  |  |
| Census region | 1=Northeast; 2=Midwest; 3=South; 4=West |  |  |  |
| Home location | Second city; 2=Rural; 3=Suburban; 4=Town; 5=Urban |  | 1=Second city; 2=Suburban; 3=Town and country; 4=Urban |  |
| Work at home option | Work at home in past two month |  | Has option working at home/No option |  |
| Internet use | Access to inter | past 6 month/No ess | Access to internet in past month/Not access |  |
| View on price (Gas , Toll, etc.) | - |  | Is a problem/Not a problem |  |

## Model Results

| Variable | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DISTTOWK>=50 (2001) | DISTTOWK>=100 (2001) | DISTTOWK>=50 (2009) | DISTTOWK>=100 (2009) |
| Gender | Male is more likely to commute long distance |  |  |  |
| Income | Workers with income more than 100,000 are more likely to commute long distance |  |  |  |
| Education | Not significant |  |  |  |
| Occupation | Not significant |  |  |  |
| Life cycle | Workers with small children are more likely to commuter long distance | Workers with small children are less likely to commuter long distance (Not significant) | Workers with small children are | s likely to commuter long distance |
| Number of worker in household | Workers who have other people work in the household are less likely to commute long distance |  |  |  |
| House ownership | Not significant |  |  |  |
| Census region | Workers in Midwest are less likely to commute long distance than works in Northeast and West | Workers in South are more likely to commute long distance then workers in West | Workers in West are more likely to commute long distance then workers in Midwest and South | Not significant |
| Home location | Workers who live in urban areas are less likely to commute long distance |  |  |  |
| Work at home option | Workers who can work at home are more likely to commute long distance |  |  |  |
| Internet use | Workers with intenet access are less likely to commute long distance |  | Not significant |  |
| View on price (Gas, Toll, etc.) |  | - | Workers have concerns about gas (an commute long distance | ther charges) are more likely to |

## Long-Distance Commute Flows in Texas

## Flow Directions One

(based on reported distance to work, 2001 NHTS)


## Flow Directions Two

(based on reported home \& work locations, 2001 NHTS)


## Flow Directions Three <br> (based on reported distance to work, 2009 NHTS)



## Interregional Long-Distance Commuting in the Texas Triangle Area

- Scott - commutes between Austin and Hallettsville daily, 2-hour drive;
- Brandy - commutes between Austin and Houston weekly, 3-hour drive;
- Lisa - commutes between Austin and Dallas biweekly, 3.5-hour drive;
- Lester - commutes between Dallas and Houston weekly, 4-hour drive, sometimes takes flight.



## Conclusions

- From 2001 to 2009, the percentage of long distance commute remained relatively stable;
- Most long distance commuters drove alone to work, and more than half of them left home before 7am and returned home after 6pm;
- Males with high level of income tend to commute long distance;
- Having the option to work at home encourages long distance commuting;
- $70 \%$ of commute with distance of 50 miles or longer was interregional in Texas;
- The Texas Triangle Area attracted more than $70 \%$ of long distance commute in Texas;


## Conclusion

- The NHTS assumes that individuals commute on a daily basis between a single fixed residence and single fixed workplace;
- Lack of information about less frequent or weekly interregional long distance commuting.


## Questions and Comments?

## Thank You!

