Table 6: Spatial Mismatch Effect under Alternate Model Specifications

	Model:	**Censored Tobit**	**Ordinary Least Squares**	**Employer Fixed Effects**	**Rescaled Ordinary Least Squares**	**Rescaled Employer Fixed Effects**
Outcome	**Variable**	1	2	3	4	5
Any new job	Job accessibility	-0.050***	-0.025***	-0.007	*-0.059*	*-0.016*
		(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.005)		
	Non-censored observations	47.5%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	R-squared (Pseudo or Standard)	0.027	0.093	0.323	N.A.	N.A.
New job earnings > 75% of previous job	Job accessibility	-0.066***	-0.030***	-0.014**	*-0.070*	*-0.033*
		(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.006)		
	Non-censored observations	42.7%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	R-squared (Pseudo or Standard)	0.032	0.074	0.319	N.A.	N.A.
New job earnings > 90% of previous job	Job accessibility	-0.083***	-0.035***	-0.017***	*-0.086*	*-0.042*
		(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.006)		
	Non-censored observations	40.6%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	R-squared (Pseudo or Standard)	0.027	0.068	0.219	N.A.	N.A.
	Adjust non-Tobit for censoring	N.A.	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Employer fixed effects	N.A.	N.A.	31,000	N.A.	31,000

NOTES: N.A. = Not available. Robust standard errors reported in parentheses. R-squared for upper- and lower-censored Tobit models is the McFadden's pseudo R-square measure, and is not directly comparable to the R-squared of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) model. R-squared for the employer fixed effects model includes both within and between variation. Tobit and OLS specifications include all control variables present in Table 5; the fixed effects model drops industry and metropolitan area effects. Columns 4 and 5 (shown in italics) adjust the coefficients of the models in Columns 2 and 3, which did not apply censoring, by dividing the coefficients by the share of non-censored records in the Tobit model (Column 1). Number of observations: 247,000.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 7: Magnitude of Expected Accessibility Effects

	Any new job		New job earnings >75% of previous job		New job earnings >90% of previous job	
Quarter	**Median Job Accessibility**	**Inter-quartile Job Accessibility Difference**	**Median Job Accessibility**	**Inter-quartile Job Accessibility Difference**	**Median Job Accessibility**	**Inter-quartile Job Accessibility Difference**
Same quarter	40.68%	0.74	29.14%	0.78	24.92%	0.89
1 quarter	12.50	0.02	10.41	0.10	9.61	0.15
2 quarters	7.24	-0.02	6.51	0.03	6.18	0.06
3 quarters	4.94	-0.04	4.69	0.01	4.54	0.02
4 quarters	3.66	-0.03	3.64	-0.01	3.56	0.01
5 quarters	2.86	-0.02	2.94	-0.01	2.92	0.00
6 quarters	2.31	-0.03	2.46	-0.01	2.46	0.00
7 quarters	1.92	-0.02	2.10	-0.01	2.12	-0.01
8 quarters	1.63	-0.02	1.82	-0.02	1.85	-0.01
>8 quarters	22.25	-0.57	36.28	-0.85	41.83	-1.10

NOTES: Computed from parameter estimates presented in Table 5. Median job accessibility is 0.036. The interquartile difference gives the expected percentage point change of searchers obtaining a job in a quarter if their job accessibility rises from the 25^{th} to 75^{th} percentile (or from -0.403 to 0.438).

Table 8: Effects of Job Accessibility, by Subsample

Search outcome	Job accessibility effect for subsample - Tobit estimation				
A: Race/Ethnicity	**White non-Hispanic**	**Black non-Hispanic**	**Hispanic**	**Other race non-Hispanic**	
Any new job	-0.042***	-0.072***	-0.084***	0.006	
	(0.011)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.044)	
Earn > 75% previous	-0.072***	-0.083***	-0.069**	0.028	
	(0.013)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.049)	
Earn > 90% previous	-0.086***	-0.116***	-0.066**	-0.032	
	(0.013)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.051)	
B: Sex and age	**Male**	**Female**	**Age 20-34**	**Age 35-54**	**Age 55-64**
Any new job	-0.049***	-0.051***	-0.031**	-0.048***	-0.117***
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.030)
Earn > 75% previous	-0.048***	-0.082***	-0.043***	-0.062***	-0.180***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.040)
Earn > 90% previous	-0.064***	-0.102***	-0.070***	-0.072***	-0.208***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.041)
C: Household status and earnings	**Married, Primary earner**	**Married, Secondary earner**	**Not-married**	**Previous earnings < $30,000**	**Previous earnings ≥ $30,000**
Any new job	-0.039	-0.043	-0.054***	-0.035***	-0.067***
	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.015)
Earn > 75% previous	-0.061**	-0.076**	-0.068***	-0.041***	-0.100***
	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.099)
Earn > 90% previous	-0.070**	-0.086***	-0.088***	-0.058***	-0.119***
	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.017)
D: Industry	**Goods-Producing**	**Local Services**	**Professional Services**	**Education and Public**	**Health Care**
Any new job	-0.080***	-0.009	-0.001	-0.113*	-0.083**
	(0.012)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.059)	(0.033)
Earn > 75% previous	-0.095***	-0.028	-0.046*	-0.109	-0.080**
	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.069)	(0.035)
Earn > 90% previous	-0.116***	-0.045**	-0.061**	-0.165**	-0.076**
	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.027)	(0.070)	(0.035)

NOTES: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Each estimate is the variable of interest in an independent specification. Specifications include all control variables present in Table 5 except for indicators used in each panel to define industry, race/ethnicity, sex, or age. See Table 3 for sample share in each estimation model.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 9: Effects of Same-Type Job Accessibility, by Industry Subsample

Panel	Search outcome	Same-type, job accessibility effect for subsample Tobit estimation				
A: Race/Ethnicity		**White Non-Hispanic**	**Black Non-Hispanic**	**Hispanic**	**Other race non-Hispanic**	
	Any new job	-0.043***	-0.061***	-0.106***	0.018	
		(0.011)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.044)	
	Earn > 75% previous	-0.073***	-0.065***	-0.081***	0.037	
		(0.013)	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.049)	
	Earn > 90% previous	-0.089***	-0.090***	-0.069**	-0.014	
		(0.013)	(0.026)	(0.031)	(0.051)	
B: Industry		**Goods-Producing**	**Local Services**	**Professional Services**	**Education and Public**	**Health Care**
	Any new job	-0.084***	-0.008	0.005	-0.047	-0.071**
		(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.055)	(0.034)
	Earn > 75% previous	-0.098***	-0.020	-0.038*	-0.050	-0.072**
		(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.065)	(0.036)
	Earn > 90% previous	-0.113***	-0.037*	-0.054**	-0.074	-0.069*
		(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.066)	(0.036)

NOTES: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Each estimate is the variable of interest in an independent specification. Specifications include all control variables present in Table 5, except for indicators used in each panel to define industry. For each subsample, the job accessibility variable limits job opportunities and competing searchers to those in the same subsample as the job searcher. See Table 3 for sample share in each estimation model.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

APPENDIX A: Estimated Travel Time

This study makes use of point-to-point travel time estimates provided by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in nine metropolitan areas. The MPOs use transportation planning models to estimate driving and transit travel times between transportation analysis zones at different times of day.[34] We first translate the analysis zones into census tracts using crosswalk files or proximity. For driving trips, we use only the travel times at the morning peak period, when routes may be most congested. Reported public transit times may refer to trips by bus, rail, tram, and other modes, depending on the metropolitan area.[35]

We impose several data edits to make the MPO data more representative of potential travel times and more comparable across metropolitan areas. For both automobile and transit, we assume zero travel time to jobs within a census tract. Because some MPOs effectively impose a minimum transit time of approximately 10 minutes, we impose that minimum for all MPOs, but also drop 5 minutes from all transit times to harmonize with auto travel, for which most MPOs indicate zero vehicle access time.

We apply some deterministic imputations in the case of missing or invalid travel times. For automobile travel, we impose a travel time one would infer from an assumed driving speed of 20 miles per hour (great circle distance) - the average reported speed. Because of incomplete transit networks, about two-thirds of tract pairs have no transit travel time. For both auto and transit travel times that are slower than walking (assumed to be 3 miles per hour) we substitute walking travel time for the reported or edited value. For potential “transit” commutes that are off the network, we always impose the walking travel time, which makes travel time to all but the nearest such tracts prohibitively long.

Table A1 presents summary statistics for travel times between directional, origin-destination pairs. In addition to median travel times, the table reports median distances traveled

[34] The MPO estimates of driving and transit travel times for large metropolitan areas are generally created by using a model that draws on the 2000 Census Transportation and Planning Package (CTPP) and local transit surveys. The models used by about 40 large US metropolitan areas are fairly similar, and are derived from one of two standard commercially-available sources. We thank the following MPO’s for providing us with commute times: Comprehensive Metropolitan Agency for Planning (Chicago), Greater Buffalo-Niagara Regional Transportation Council, Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus), Minneapolis Metropolitan Council, Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (Cleveland), Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (Detroit), Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (Pittsburgh), Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (Milwaukee).

[35] Although some MPOs provide information on “park-and-ride” commute times, where one drives to a transit stop, we only consider routes that are entirely transit-based.

and median implied speeds. Based on the latitude and longitude of an internal point in each census tract, we calculate the great circle distance between pairs of points. The distance presented here is a minimum distance, because the road network will often be less direct. Using the travel time and distance together, we calculate an implied speed in miles per hour, which is also likely to be a lower bound on road speed (roads are often less direct). The first row lists the count of directional pairs represented in each column, with a domain of 5.267 million pairs. We weight statistics by the LODES commute flow along each route.[36]

Table A1: Travel Times for Automobile and Transit from Survey Responses and Model Estimates

	Automobile				**Transit**			
			CTPP pairs only				**CTPP pairs only**	
Tract-to-tract metric	**MPO reported**	**MPO and imputes**	**MPO and imputes**	**CTPP**	**MPO reported**	**MPO and imputes**	**MPO and imputes**	**CTPP**
Tract flow pairs (millions)	5.227	5.267	1.675	1.675	2.743	5.267	0.185	0.185
Median distance (miles)	8.32	8.28	4.93	4.93	8.07	8.28	5.27	5.27
Median time (minutes)	24.93	24.85	16.94	15.80	67.90	90.85	42.40	35.10
Median speed (miles/hour)	19.55	19.59	17.52	17.61	7.02	3.62	7.21	9.12

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from MPO travel time data, Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP), and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES).
NOTES: The domain includes 5,266,871 tract-to-tract pairs within the set of metropolitan areas. Tract-to-tract distances, MPO travel times and speeds are weighted by LODES job flows between pairs. Columns 1 and 5 list only MPO-reported commutes and edits for automobile and transit travel respectively. Columns 2 and 6 list all commutes, including imputed travel times. The remaining columns list only commutes with CTPP travel times.

Columns 1 and 5 give the commute statistics for the reported MPO commutes, with times edited as described above, while columns 2 and 6 also include imputed commutes and represent all possible pairs. The median auto travel time of about 25 minutes changes little with the addition of imputed routes, because MPOs report auto times for almost all routes. In contrast, median transit time rises from over an hour to almost an hour and a half, because for the half of routes with no transit available, we impute based on walking speed.

In columns 3, 4, 7, and 8, we compare MPO travel times to a representative survey sample for the set of metropolitan areas. The Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) - built from the 2000 Decennial Census - provides reported travel times, but only for the routes

[36] For the census tract pairs presented here, LODES provides the count of workers using each route in 2005.

actually traveled. Comparing CTPP travel times to MPO travel times provides an objective evaluation of whether MPO travel times are a good representation of proximity. To minimize measurement error from the survey travel times, we include only the census tract pairs with at least 10 CTPP commutes by automobile or transit (also excluding within-tract commutes).[37] For the automobile pairs, we find an MPO median travel time of about 17 minutes, very close to the CTPP median travel time of about 16 minutes. The transit travel times are more divergent, with MPOs giving an average travel time of 42 minutes compared to only 35 minutes in CTPP. For the same pairs of tracts, we find an MPO-CTPP correlation of 0.59 for automobile travel times and 0.47 for transit travel times.

[37] The CTPP automobile times are for commuters driving their own vehicle to work, leaving between 5:00 a.m. to 8:59 a.m. The CTPP transit times are for all other modes.

APPENDIX B: Individualized Travel Time Predictions

This section describes the development of the personalized prediction of transit use on each potential commute route. The goal is to generate an expectation of whether a particular job seeker would use automobile or transit to commute to a job in any tract. Because LEHD jobs data and the MPO travel time data have no information on an individual's commute choices, we obtain commute choices from the 2000 Census long form responses – the Sample Edited Detail File (SEDF). We estimate models of vehicle count and mode choice for respondents, and use the parameter estimates to predict whether individuals in the job seeker dataset are likely to commute by public transit. We use this predicted probability of auto or transit use to weight accessibility to jobs in a tract, with accessibility of each mode depending on travel time for that mode.

We combine the 2000 Census long form responses with the same datasets used to create the sample of displaced workers. We first extract a sample of approximately 693,000 employed respondents from the SEDF, who commute to a job in one of the nine metropolitan areas in our sample.[38] As with the displaced worker sample, we match these records to neighborhood, commute time, and earnings data, with sample restrictions documented in Table B1.[39] Because we are focusing on mode choice, we limit the sample to residents of tracts with a feasible transit option by requiring that at least 5 percent of residents report commuting by transit and that at least 10 percent of routes to workplaces from that tract have an MPO transit travel time.[40] These restrictions reduce the sample by a cumulative 84.3 percent, resulting in a sample of approximately 109,000 workers who might plausibly use either mode.

[38] We are limited to records with a (de-duplicated) Personal Identification Key (PIK) and define employment based on an Employment Status Recode of '1' and a Class of Worker of '1' to '4', including private sector and state and local government employees. We also limit to the age range in 2000 to 20-64, to those commuting (we exclude those working from home) to a job in an MPO county with LEHD data in 2000 (all but two study states), and to those with household information (a small share of records do not match to the household file). We exclude Michigan and Ohio cities from this estimation because they lack sufficient pre-2000 earnings histories.

[39] We match by PIK to the Composite Person Record file of administrative residence data for the year 2000, and require residence in one of the MPO counties. We then match the respondent to MPO travel time data by place of work and place of residence census tract, and to the Summary File 1 neighborhood data by residence census tract. We limit to those having LEHD earnings in each quarter from 1999:2 to 2000:2, and require that earnings from 1999:2 to 2000:1 be between $15,000 and $40,000.

[40] MPOs report estimated auto travel times between almost all tract pairs, but sometimes omit transit. Some MPOs have explained that they do not provide transit times when that mode is not available.

Table B1: Construction of Transit Mode Choice Sample

Sample restriction	Sample	Percent dropped
Respondent commuting to job in selected metro areas in 2000	693,000	N.A.
Linked to residence in same metro area	682,000	1.6%
Residence tract has >5% workers commuting by transit	572,000	16.1%
Residence tract has MPO provided transit travel times for >10% routes	527,000	7.9%
Worker linked to full year of LEHD earnings	498,000	5.5%
Annual earnings of $15,000 to $40,000	109,000	78.1%

SOURCES: Census 2000 SEDF (long form sample microdata), LEHD Composite Person Record (CPR), Census 2000 Summary File 1, Metropolitan Planning Organization travel times, LEHD Employment History File.

We use the combined datasets to construct the mode choice variables, as well as variables that are identical to those available for the displaced worker sample. Table B2 presents the cross-tabulation of the vehicle count categories and transit use for the linked sample described in B1, which we derive from responses on the long form.[41] We define transit as any mode besides car/truck/van, taxicab, or motorcycle (with those working at home excluded). Thus, walking and bicycle riding are included in transit use. Even for this transit-feasible subset, the dominance of automobile use is evident – 91.5 percent have at least one vehicle and 82.6 percent travel by car. Note that even among workers with no vehicle of their own, over a third commute by car (presumably many of these workers participate in carpools).

Table B2: Vehicle possession and Mode Use of Transit Choice Sample

	Commute mode		
Household number of vehicles	Automobile	Transit	Both modes
0	3.0%	5.5%	8.5%
1	25.8%	6.7%	32.5%
2	36.5%	3.9%	40.4%
3+	17.3%	1.4%	18.7%
All households	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations for sample described in Table B1.

[41] From the long form question "How many automobiles, vans, and trucks of one-ton capacity or less are kept at home for use by members of your household?" we construct an automobile count of up to three or more vehicles for a household. From the long form question "How did this person usually get to work LAST WEEK?" we construct a commute mode variable indicating whether a worker used transit.

From the merged MPO travel times we construct a variable of transit inefficiency to a worker's current workplace, measured as MPO transit time divided by auto time. We use the LEHD earnings data for a worker and household members to measure the count of persons, earners, annual worker and household earnings, and earnings per worker. We construct demographic variables from the 2000 SEDF and from linked measures of neighborhood characteristics.

Our approach includes two stages of estimation for variables available only in the SEDF-based sample. First, for all workers, we estimate the number of vehicles in a worker's household with an ordered logistic model, for the categorical values in Table B2. Using these estimates, we predict vehicle count within-sample, and create a variable for the probability that a worker has at least one car. These same estimates are then used to predict vehicles for the out-of-sample displaced workers. Second, for all workers, we run two binary logistic regressions with transit use as the dependent variable. The first logit weights each worker by his or her predicted probability of having a car, and the second one weights by the complement.

Table B3 presents estimates from the both stages, and shows how some factors affecting transit use depend on the likelihood of having a vehicle. Column 1 presents the first stage, where we find, unsurprisingly, that households with more earners, persons, and higher earnings have more cars. A worker with an inefficient transit commute is especially likely to be in a household with cars. Dense neighborhoods and those with high public transit use are less likely to have cars. Columns 2 and 3 present the second stage, where we find that workers with inefficient transit routes are less likely to use transit, as are those with higher earnings. The interaction of transit inefficiency and annual worker earnings shows that as transit becomes less practical, higher earning workers are especially likely to switch to auto commuting. This finding is consistent with higher earners having a higher value of travel time and being more willing to pay for auto travel, which typically saves time but costs more. We find that women, non-Hispanic whites, older workers, and those in high public transit neighborhoods are more likely to use transit. Some coefficients have different magnitudes and signs across the two logits, which is due to the differences in probability of having a car. Young workers are less likely to use transit if their household has a car. More dense neighborhoods reduce transit use when a household is more likely to have a car.

Table B3: Estimation of Vehicle Count and Transit Mode Choice

Dependent variable:	**Number of Vehicles (0, 1, 2, or 3+)**	**Transit use (with vehicle)**	**Transit use (no vehicle)**
Weights:	**None**	**Probability has a vehicle (from column 1)**	**Probability has no vehicle (from column 1)**
Model:	**Ordered Logit**	**Binary Logit**	**Binary Logit**
Variable	1	2	3
Household earners (maximum 10)	0.237***		
	(0.009)		
Persons in household (maximum 10)	0.011***		
	(0.004)		
Household annual log earnings (LEHD)	0.666***		
	(0.014)		
Ratio of transit to auto travel time	0.130***	-1.478***	-1.071***
	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.017)
Worker annual log earnings (LEHD)		-0.774***	-0.934***
		(0.042)	(0.038)
Interaction: earnings and time ratio		-1.119***	-0.948***
		(0.067)	(0.055)
Log earnings per worker (LEHD)		-0.179	-0.114**
		(0.026)	(0.027)
Female	-0.116***	0.189**	0.142**
	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.016)
Black non-Hispanic	-0.322***	-0.052	-0.093
	(0.017)	(0.025)	(0.019)
Hispanic	0.224***	-0.405***	-0.485***
	(0.020)	(0.030)	(0.027)
Other race non-Hispanic	0.184***	-0.038***	-0.150**
	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.038)
Age 20 to 24	0.489***	-0.005**	0.021
	(0.022)	(0.032)	(0.031)
Age 35 to 44	-0.106**	0.012***	0.097***
	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.019)
Age 45 to 54	0.015***	0.059	0.209***
	(0.016)	(0.025)	(0.021)
Age 55 to 64	-0.165***	0.080***	0.142***
	(0.020)	(0.032)	(0.025)
Tract: Population per square mile	-23.675***	-17.274***	3.319
	(2.149)	(2.933)	(1.678)
Tract: Public transit use rate	-2.576***	3.593***	3.129***
	(0.083)	(0.116)	(0.077)
Tract: Poverty rate	0.431***	-0.740***	-1.113***
	(0.083)	(0.120)	(0.080)
Tract: Home ownership rate	1.467***	-0.955***	-1.128***
	(0.039)	(0.060)	(0.050)
Tract: Median home age (in 2000)	-0.005***	0.007***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)

NOTES: Standard errors in parentheses. Number of observations: 109,000. Estimates from model 1 are used to predict probabilities of having a vehicle. These expectations are used as weights in model 2, while the complement (not having a car) weights model 3.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

For the displaced worker sample, we use the estimates from Table B3 to calculate expected transit use for each possible route. Because the displaced worker sample has identically constructed variables, it is possible to make this out-of-sample prediction. First, we calculate the expected probability of the job seeker's household having a vehicle, using the estimates from Column 1. Then, for the same worker, we calculate probability of transit use with the estimates in Column 2 and 3. Lastly, we use the expected probability of having a car to create a weighted average of the probability of using public transit on each route. This probability of transit use feeds into the predicted job accessibility ratio calculation in equation (11). Using the same rules as described above for transit feasibility, we only apply these probabilities to workers residing in the 41 percent of Census tracts with feasible transit options. We assume all other workers posses a car and drive to potential job opportunities.

The results presented here are informative about the factors affecting transit use. However, as is explained before, auto availability and usage is widespread. Ultimately, the minimal use of transit limits the efficacy of this approach in adding personalized variation to travel time measures.

APPENDIX C: Robustness Tests

Table C1 presents the variance/covariance and correlations for various job accessibility ratios with varied assumptions on the use of automobile and transit, providing some intuition on the importance of equation (11) employing predicted mode use. The first two measures, calculated assuming either $\hat{p}_{ijk(\text{auto})} = 1$ or $\hat{p}_{ijk(\text{transit})} = 1$ are only weakly correlated (0.25), suggesting that in theory, incorporating transit usage could add information to the job accessibility measure. However, the predicted job access ratio, which incorporates the weighted likelihood of using each mode, turns out to mostly composed of variation from automobile commutes. This should not be very surprising, given that only 7 percent of workers use transit in the relevant residential census tracts. In Column 3 of each panel, note that the contribution of auto access to the combined measure accounts for most of the variation and has a correlation of 0.96, while the transit contribution has a correlation of only 0.21. Column 4 shows that these auto and transit contributions are actually slightly negatively related to one another. The last element of each panel, which is used for all the main results in this paper, gives a predicted access ratio where only workers in tracts with a feasible transit option are given any possibility of using transit.

Table C1: Relationship of Access Ratio Measures, by Travel Time

	Auto	Transit	Predicted	Predicted Auto	Predicted Transit	Predicted, Feasible Transit
Panel A: Covariance						
Automobile	0.36					
Transit	0.09	0.37				
Predicted	0.35	0.12	0.35			
Predicted auto contribution	0.36	0.04	0.35	0.37		
Predicted transit contribution	0.03	0.22	0.05	-0.01	0.15	
Predicted (only feasible transit)	0.35	0.11	0.35	0.35	0.04	0.35
Panel B: Correlation						
Automobile	1.00					
Transit	0.25	1.00				
Predicted	0.99	0.32	1.00			
Predicted auto contribution	0.98	0.12	0.96	1.00		
Predicted transit contribution	0.12	0.91	0.22	-0.03	1.00	
Predicted (only feasible transit)	0.99	0.29	1.00	0.97	0.18	1.00

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics files matched with Census 2000 microdata. NOTE: Number of observations: 247,000.

Table C2 demonstrates the robustness of the main result to variations on the job accessibility measure. Rows 1 to 3 present a range of discounting thresholds where $\tau = 5$ minutes and $\tau = 15$ minutes, rather than $\tau = 10$ minutes as used in the main text (repeated in in row 2). This variation in the threshold has little effect on the estimates. Row 4 substitutes an automobile-based proximity measure, that is, $\hat{p}_{ijk(\text{auto})} = 1$. As might be expected given the high correlation of auto accessibility and predicted accessibility shown in Table C1, the automobile estimates are similar, with slightly lower magnitude. Rows 5 and 6 limit the sample to searchers residing in tracts with feasible transit (only 102,000 observations), to focus on the importance of predicted job accessibility for these searchers. For these transit-feasible searchers, both the auto-only and predicted job accessibility measures reduce search duration, but the predicted measure has a larger magnitude. The last specification disaggregates the auto and transit components of job accessibility, by calculating accessibility separately for the first and second terms of the predicted job opportunities calculation in equation (9). These estimates show that auto accessibility is the dominant factor in the job accessibility effect.

Table C2: Alternate access ratio and outcome measures

	Any new job	New job >75% of previous earnings	New job >90% of previous earnings
Job accessibility variable	1	2	3
Predicted, feasible, 5 minutes	-0.051***	-0.065***	-0.082***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Predicted, feasible, 10 minutes	-0.050***	-0.066***	-0.083***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Predicted, feasible, 15 minutes	-0.050***	-0.069***	-0.087***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Auto, 10 minutes	-0.046***	-0.064***	-0.082***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Auto, feasible only, 10 minutes	-0.034**	-0.047**	-0.074***
	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Predicted, feasible only, 10 minutes	-0.041**	-0.053***	-0.082***
	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Predicted-auto, feasible only, 10 minutes	-0.038**	-0.046**	-0.064***
	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Predicted-transit, feasible only, 10 minutes	0.019	0.006	-0.024
	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.024)

NOTES: Predicted job accessibility indicates the measure in equation (11). Robust standard errors reported in parentheses. For first four rows, number of observations: 247,000. For "feasible only" rows, including only observations in tracts with a feasible transit option, number of observations: 102,000.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10