Do Urban Form Characteristics Perpetuate Disparities in POI-based Mobility Changes during COVID-19?

A Study of Fulton County, Georgia

Jun Wang and Yilun Zha School of Architecture, Georgia Tech



Mobility Plummet in light of COVID-19

- A 20-30% reduction of movement in the U.S. from early 2020 to 2021
 - First case in US: Jan 21, 2020
 - Georgia lockdown mandate: Mar 14, 2020
- Varying Impacts by purpose of trips
 - Most reduction in **Transit** and **Workplaces** trips
 - A "retaliatory" bounce-back on Parks



(Source: Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Report)

Mobility Changes: An uneven geography

Regional and Metro/Urban-level research

- Mobility Trend Tracking GeoDS Lab@UW-Madison
- Course-grained hotspot detection (Zhu et al., 2022)

Neighborhood-level study is limited

- Socioeconomic disparities "Staying at home is a privilege" (Huang et al., 2021)
- Knowledge Gap: fine-grained mobility changes by types and its spatial interpretation/association



(Source: Huang et al., 2021)



Research Question

 On the neighborhood level, how does the mobility for different types of movement vary?

• Key Hypothesis: The pattern of changes are different and may not merely follow the socioeconomic pattern.

- To what extent is **the neighborhood-level built environment characteristics** associated with the disparity of mobility change, if existing, after controlling for SES factors?
 - Key Hypothesis: More Compact, denser neighborhoods may experience a lighter impact.



Research Design – Study Area

Fulton County, Georgia

- Most populous county (1M+) in GA
- House of the state capital: Atlanta
- General Context: The Growth Line

- Unit of Analysis: census-tract
 - N=204
 - CBG-level data also available but unstable



Research Design - Data

Restaurants and Other Eating Places

frequency of visit

- 200 to 3,403
- 3,403 to 6,605 6.605 to 9.808
- 9.808 to 13.010
- 13.010 to 16.213
- POI-based Aggregated Cellular Data from SafeGraph
 - Aggregated at census-block-group or census-tract level
 - Sampled: 5-10% sampling rate
 - POIs categorized by 2022 4-digit NAICS Code
- Tech Specs:
 - Time frame: March 2019 March 2021
 - Num. of POIs: 66,310
 - OD pairs: 1M (2019), 800k (2020)
- Privacy Concerns



Research Design - Data

- Built Environment Characteristics
 - Selected by literature and experiences
 - Four Domains: Density, Connectivity, Diversity, and Centrality

- SES Variables
 - Income, race, education

| Category | Variable | Label | Formula | Unit | Reference | |
|--------------|--|--------------------|---|---------|-------------------------------|--|
| | Built Area Density | bld_ratio | $BD_t = \sum_{i=1}^{i} A_{it}^B / A_t^T$ | % | (Schirmer & Axhausen, 2016) | |
| Density | Population Density | popden_sqmi | $PD_t = Pop_t/A_t^T$ | #/sqmi | (Hamidi et al., 2015) | |
| Density | Mean Setback | setback_avg_ ft | $SB_t^{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{i} SB_{it} / i$ | ft | (Clifton et al., 2008b) | |
| | Average Block Size | blk_avg_sqft | $K_t^{\mu} = A_{mt}^K/m$ | sqft | | |
| | Transit Stop Density | stopden | $TSDen_t = TS_t / A_t^T$ | #/sqmi | (Clifton et al., 2008c) | |
| Connectivity | Street Density | stden | $SDen_t = L_t^{\varepsilon}/A_t^T$ | ft/sqmi | (Boeing, 2017) | |
| | Intersection Density | interden | $ID_t = I_t / A_t^T$ | #/sqmi | (Boeing, 2017) | |
| | Standard Deviation of Building Size | bld_sd_sqft | $B_t^{\theta} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^i (A_{it}^B - \mu_t^B)^2 / i}$ | - | (Schirmer & Axhausen, 2016) | |
| Diversity | Entropy of Landuse Mix | tct_entro | $E_t = \sum_{u=1}^u \rho_{ut} \times \ln \rho_{ut}$ | - | (Song, Merlin, et al., 2013 | |
| | Mean Building Fractality | fract_avg | $F_t^{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{i} F_{it} / i$ | - | (Basaraner & Cetinkaya, 2017) | |
| Centrality | Betweenness Centrality | centrality | $g(v) = \sum_{\substack{o \neq v \neq d}} \sigma_{od}(v) / \sigma_{od}$ | - | (Song, Merlin, et al., 2013) | |
| | Number of Incoming Trips per capita | trip_inwards | $TR_t = \sum D_{pt} / Pop_t$ | # | | |



Research Design – Method

• Longitudinal Descriptive Analysis

- Comparison: pre-COVID vs. COVID
- Metrics: 1. frequency of trips per capita
 - 2. weighted Shannon Entropy of trip types (diversity)
 - 3. weighted average distance to destinations
- Trip Types: Restaurant, Park, Healthcare Facilities

OLS and Spatial Lag Principal Component Regression



Results - Descriptive



Diff = # of 2020 - # of 2019



- Urban tracts travel to more distant destinations compared to suburban tracts
 - An average of **1.2-mile INCREASE** within the city limit of Atlanta, compared to a **1-mile DECREASE** for others

Growth-No Growth

Urban - Suburban

Random



• No visible pattern found on Entropy

Results - Descriptive





Freq. of Trips per capita

Results – PCA/FA

- Good cumulative variance
 explained: 75.1%
- Great match with preconceived conceptual structure: 4 Factors
 - FC1 Density + Connectivity
 - FC2 Diversity
 - FC3 Density
 - FC4 Centrality
- Strong association between connectivity and density

Table 4: Rotated Factor Structure of built environment variables

| Variables | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| Density | | | | | | |
| bld_ratio | 0.619 | 0.228 | 0.590 | 0.172 | | |
| popden_sqmi | 0.639 | | 0.445 | | | |
| setback_avg_ft | -0.787 | 0.284 | -0.219 | | | |
| blk_avg_sqft | -0.359 | 0.343 | -0.671 | | | |
| Connectivity | | | | | | |
| interden | 0.933 | | | | | |
| stden | 0.900 | | 0.226 | | | |
| stopden | 0.569 | 0.101 | | | | |
| Diversity | | | | | | |
| tct_entro | -0.280 | 0.715 | | | | |
| bld_sd_sqft | | 0.785 | | | | |
| fract_avg | -0.228 | -0.850 | -0.173 | | | |
| Centrality | | | | -0.156 | | |
| betweeness_centrality | | 0.422 | 0.723 | | | |
| trip_inwards | | 0.103 | | 0.981 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Factor 1 (Density + Connectivity) | 1 | | | | | |
| Factor 2 (Diversity) | | 1 | | | | |
| Factor 3 (Density + Centrality) | | | 1 | | | |
| Factor 4 (Centrality) | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Eigenvalue | 4.71 | 2.52 | 0.94 | 0.82 | | |
| Proportion Var. explained | 30.7% | 19.2% | 16.4% | 8.7% | | |
| Cumulative Var. explained | 30.7% | 49.9% | 66.4% | 75.1% | | |

Results – PCA/FA

- Inner-ring suburban tracts have lower connectivity than most outer suburban tracts
- Bivariate correlation: First three factors have moderate to strong associations with the change in trip distance





Results – Regression

| | | OLS | | | | | | | Spatial Lag | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | Dep | endent Variables | | • | | | |
| | trip counts per capita | | trip type entropy | | average trip distance | | Restaurant trip counts per capita | | Restaurant trip counts per capita | | average trip distance | |
| | estimate | p-value | estimate | p-value | estimate | p-value | estimate | p-value | estimate | p-value | estimate | p-value |
| Urban Form Factors | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FC1 (Density + Connectivity) | -2.701 | 6.35e-07 *** | 0.011 | 0.148 | 0.240 | 1.21e-10 *** | -0.764 | 1.12e-11 *** | -0.610 | < 2e-16 *** | 0.149 | < 2e-16 *** |
| FC2 (Diversity) | -1.270 | 0.006 ** | 3.802e-04 | 0.956 | 0.072 | 0.021 * | -0.305 | 0.001 ** | -0.253 | 0.005 ** | 0.074 | 0.008 ** |
| FC3 (Density + Centrality) | -1.437 | 0.006 ** | 0.014 | 0.061 . | 0.349 | < 2e-16 *** | -0.345 | 0.001 ** | -0.254 | 0.014 * | 0.234 | < 2e-16 *** |
| FC4 (Centrality) | -1.322 | 0.006 ** | 0.003 | 0.718 | 0.001 | 0.963 | -0.312 | 0.001 ** | -0.262 | 0.004 ** | 0.002 | 0.938 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SES Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| medhhinc | -8.325e-05 | 0.001 *** | 6.083e-07 | 0.063 . | 4.22e-07 | 0.772 | -1.214e-05 | 0.006 ** | -9.542e-06 | 0.023 * | 2.612e-07 | 0.844 |
| pc_white | 7.474 | 0.028 * | -0.004 | 0.936 | -0.255 | 0.262 | 1.538 | 0.025 * | 1.425 | 0.029 * | -0.027 | 0.893 |
| pc_bachelors | -3.521 | 0.485 | -0.118 | 0.121 | 0.007 | 0.982 | -2.047 | 0.045 * | -1.934 | 0.049 * | -0.160 | 0.605 |
| | | | | · | | • | | · | | · | | |
| COVID | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| vac_per_capita | 3.967 | 0.655 | 0.061 | 0.648 | -1.857 | 0.002 ** | 1.508 | 0.401 | 1.446 | 0.406 | -0.926 | 0.102 |
| | | | - | | | | _ | | _ | | | |
| Spatial Lag | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| rho | | | | | | | | | 0.224 | 0.017 * | 0.387 | < 2e-16 *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -10.084 | 1.13e-15 *** | -0.058 | 0.001 *** | 0.166 | 0.032 * | -1.274 | 1.35e-07 *** | -0.916 | 0.001 *** | 0.114 | 0.111 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Observation | | 201 | 201 | | 201 | | 201 | | 201 | | 201 | |
| R2 | 0 | 0.263 | 0.032 | | 0.547 | | 0.395 | | 0.415 | | 0.606 | |
| Adjusted R2 | 0 | 0.232 | 0.008 | | 0.528 0.370 | | 0.409 | | 0.602 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spatial Dependence | | -1 | | 1 | | - 1 | | | | | | |
| Lagrange Multiplier (lag) | 3.977 | * | 0.186 | 0.656 | 23.1662 | *** | 4.357 | * | | | | |
| Robust LM (lag) | 17.036 | *** | 0.537 | 0.463 | 31.383 | *** | 10.118 | ** | | | | |
| Iorguo Doro | 147 084 | *** | 3527.48 | *** | 2.532 | 0.281 | 2140.561 | *** | | | | |

Note: Significance codes: p <0.001'***' p<0.01 '**' p<0.05 '*' p<0.1 '.'

Results – Regression

- All factors are significantly associated with trip frequencies and trip distance
 - Density, connectivity, and diversity increase the chance of having **FEWER** reduction on trip frequencies
 - Surprisingly, those "good" traits **INCREASE** the average travel distance during COVID-19

- Highest goodness-of-fit from the spatial model on trip distance (R2 = 0.602)
 - no association found on entropy (diversity)

Discussion and Conclusion

 Built environment characteristics show a strong association with overall mobility as well as mobility to public spaces

- The mix of **economic adversity** and **poor-quality built environment** can lead to serious impact on disadvantaged population during public health crisis
 - A combination of the urban-suburban and growth-no-Growth

 Some trips cannot be replaced by the digitalization of food/work. Urban design in the post-pandemic era should prioritize those experiences.



Thank you!

Jun Wang jwang3095@gatech.edu

Yilun Zha yilunzha@gatech.edu

