

Active Transportation and Health:

An Equity Perspective

Lindsay M. Braun, PhD

Assistant Professor Department of Urban and Regional Planning University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

> Illinois Transportation and Highway Engineering (T.H.E.) Conference February 25, 2020

Can infrastructure investment support public health?

Can infrastructure investment support public health?



















SOCIAL EQUITY

Built environment



Public health

Can infrastructure investment support public health?

Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

Can infrastructure investment support health equity?

Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

Can infrastructure investment support <u>health equity</u>?

Why (and where) might cycling be <u>unhealthy?</u>



Why (and where) might cycling be <u>unhealthy?</u>



Why (and where) might cycling be <u>unhealthy?</u>



Examining health tradeoffs

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

```
Physical activity
     (PA)
Air pollution
     (AP)
Injury risk (IR)
```

Examining health tradeoffs

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)



Examining health tradeoffs



Associations between **bike lanes**, **sociodemographic advantage**, and **bicycle commuting** in 22 U.S. cities



New York, NY Los Angeles, CA Chicago, IL Dallas, TX Houston, TX Washington, DC Philadelphia, PA Miami, FL Atlanta, GA Boston, MA San Francisco, CA Phoenix, AZ Detroit, MI Seattle, WA Minneapolis, MN San Diego, CA Tampa, FL Denver, CO Charlotte, NC Portland, OR Orlando, FL San Antonio, TX

• **Bike lanes:** Local/regional GIS websites (2012–2016) and longitudinal built environment database (1990–2010)



 Sociodemographic characteristics and covariates: American Community Survey and U.S. Census

		No lanes (n=12,487)	Any lanes (n=9,359)	p- value
SES variables	Race (% black)	25.1	20.9	0.00
	Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	31.0	26.3	0.00
	Poverty (% in poverty)	21.3	20.7	0.01
	Income (\$1000s)	56.7	61.1	0.00
	Education (% with BA/BS)	30.8	38.3	0.00
	Composite SES	-0.50	0.67	0.00

		No lanes (n=12,487)	Any lanes (n=9,359)	p- value
SES variables	Race (% black)	25.1	20.9	0.00
	Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	31.0	26.3	0.00
	Poverty (% in poverty)	21.3	20.7	0.01
	Income (\$1000s)	56.7	61.1	0.00
	Education (% with BA/BS)	30.8	38.3	0.00
	Composite SES	-0.50	0.67	0.00

		No lanes (n=12,487)	Any lanes (n=9,359)	p- value
SES variables	Race (% black)	25.1	20.9	0.00
	Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	31.0	26.3	0.00
	Poverty (% in poverty)	21.3	20.7	0.01
	Income (\$1000s)	56.7	61.1	0.00
	Education (% with BA/BS)	30.8	38.3	0.00
	Composite SES	-0.50	0.67	0.00

		No lanes (n=12,487)	Any lanes (n=9,359)	p- value
SES variables	Race (% black)	25.1	20.9	0.00
	Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	31.0	26.3	0.00
	Poverty (% in poverty)	21.3	20.7	0.01
	Income (\$1000s)	56.7	61.1	0.00
	Education (% with BA/BS)	30.8	38.3	0.00
	Composite SES	-0.50	0.67	0.00

- Bike lanes more common in areas with:

- Lower percentages of **black** and **Hispanic** residents and lower **poverty** rates
- Higher income, educational attainment, and composite SES

		No lanes (n=12,487)	Any lanes (n=9,359)	p- value
SES variables	Race (% black)	25.1	20.9	0.00
	Ethnicity (% Hispanic)	31.0	26.3	0.00
	Poverty (% in poverty)	21.3	20.7	0.01
	Income (\$1000s)	56.7	61.1	0.00
	Education (% with BA/BS)	30.8	38.3	0.00
	Composite SES	-0.50	0.67	0.00

- Bike lanes more common in areas with:

- Lower percentages of **black** and **Hispanic** residents and lower **poverty** rates
- Higher **income**, **educational attainment**, and composite **SES**
- Many relationships persist after controlling for **other key determinants**











2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS)

Barriers to cycling


2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS)



2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS)



• 8.3% of respondents cycled

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **race and ethnicity**

	% who cycle
Non-Hispanic White	8.8
Non-Hispanic Black	6.6
Hispanic	7.7
Non-Hispanic Asian	7.5
Other	7.8

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **race and ethnicity**

	% who cycle	% who report barriers
Non-Hispanic White	8.8	36
Non-Hispanic Black	6.6	45
Hispanic	7.7	46
Non-Hispanic Asian	7.5	52
Other	7.8	41

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **income**

	% who cycle
< \$25,000	7.5
\$25,000-\$49,999	6.8
\$50,000-\$74,999	7.7
\$75,000-\$99,999	8.3
\$100,000-\$124,999	9.3
\$125,000 +	10.6

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **income**

	% who cycle	% who report barriers
< \$25,000	7.5	49
\$25,000-\$49,999	6.8	43
\$50,000-\$74,999	7.7	39
\$75,000-\$99,999	8.3	38
\$100,000-\$124,999	9.3	32
\$125,000 +	10.6	33

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **educational attainment**

	% who cycle
Less than bachelor's	6.4
Bachelor's or more	10.9

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **educational attainment**

	% who cycle	
Less than bachelor's	6.4	38
Bachelor's or more	10.9	40

- 8.3% of respondents cycled
- **39%** of cyclists reported at least one environmental barrier
- Differences by **educational attainment**

	% who cycle	
Less than bachelor's	6.4	38
Bachelor's or more	10.9	40

- Respondents of color and low SES were (generally)...
 - Less likely to cycle
 - More likely to report environmental barriers

- Associations between cycling/barrier status and health for:
 - Non-cyclists
 - Cyclists who don't report barriers
 - Cyclists who report barriers

• Associations between cycling/barrier status and health for:

- Non-cyclists
- Cyclists who don't report barriers
- Cyclists who report barriers

	Association with health
Non-cyclists	(ref)
Cyclists – no barriers	0.61***
Cyclists – barriers	0.35***

- Associations between cycling/barrier status and health for:
 - Non-cyclists
 - Cyclists who don't report barriers
 - Cyclists who report barriers

	Association with health
Non-cyclists	(ref)
Cyclists – no barriers	0.61***
Cyclists – barriers	0.35***

• Associations between cycling and health were *weaker* in the presence of barriers

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)



Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

Can infrastructure investment support health equity?

Associations between **bike lanes**, **sociodemographic advantage**, and **bicycle commuting** in 22 U.S. cities



New York, NY Los Angeles, CA Chicago, IL Dallas, TX Houston, TX Washington, DC Philadelphia, PA Miami, FL Atlanta, GA Boston, MA San Francisco, CA Phoenix, AZ Detroit, MI Seattle, WA Minneapolis, MN San Diego, CA Tampa, FL Denver, CO Charlotte, NC Portland, OR Orlando, FL San Antonio, TX









 Positive associations between bike lanes and bicycle commuting **become stronger** with increasing sociodemographic advantage

 Positive associations between bike lanes and bicycle commuting **become stronger** with increasing sociodemographic advantage



- Resistance to bike lanes in traditionally disadvantaged neighborhoods
 - Albina (Portland, OR)
 - Humboldt Park (Chicago, IL)
 - Shaw (Washington, DC)

- Resistance to bike lanes in traditionally disadvantaged neighborhoods
 - Albina (Portland, OR)
 - Humboldt Park (Chicago, IL)
 - Shaw (Washington, DC)

Why are bike lanes such heated symbols of gentrification?



Stein 2015 (Washington Post)

- Resistance to bike lanes in traditionally disadvantaged neighborhoods
 - Albina (Portland, OR)
 - Humboldt Park (Chicago, IL)
 - Shaw (Washington, DC)
- Gentrification concerns may:
 - Be literal or symbolic
 - Result from institutional factors
 - Result from framing

Why are bike lanes such heated symbols of gentrification?



Stein 2015 (Washington Post)

 Framing as economic development

- Local spending
- Property value impacts
- "Creative class"
- → Raises questions about who belongs, who benefits

www.pedbikeimages.org / Adam Coppola Photograph



		Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
000	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-20	Already advantaged			
199	Gentrifying			
010	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-20	Already advantaged			
200	Gentrifying			
15	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-20	Already advantaged			
201	Gentrifying			

		Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
000	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-2(Already advantaged			
199	Gentrifying			
010	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-2(Already advantaged			
200	Gentrifying			
15	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-20	Already advantaged			
201	Gentrifying			

		Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
000	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-2(Already advantaged			
199	Gentrifying			
110	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-2(Already advantaged			
200	Gentrifying			
15	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
0-20	Already advantaged			
201	Gentrifying			

		Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
1990–2000	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
	Already advantaged			
	Gentrifying			
2000–2010	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
	Already advantaged			
	Gentrifying			
2010-2015	Disadv. but not gentrifying			
	Already advantaged			
	Gentrifying			

	Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
Gentrification indicator			
Disadvantaged but not gentrifying	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)
Already advantaged			
Gentrifying			

	Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
Gentrification indicator			
Disadvantaged but not gentrifying	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)
Already advantaged			
Gentrifying			

 Some evidence of more bike lane investment in places that were either already advantaged or becoming more advantaged over time
Are bike lanes associated with gentrification?

	Chicago	Minneapolis	Oakland
Gentrification indicator			
Disadvantaged but not gentrifying	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)
Already advantaged			
Gentrifying			

- Some evidence of more bike lane investment in places that were either already advantaged or becoming more advantaged over time
- Other results suggest that gentrification occurs **before** or during the same decade as bike lane investment

Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

Can infrastructure investment support health equity?

Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

• Disparities in access to bike lanes

Is active transportation healthy <u>for everyone</u>?

- Disparities in access to bike lanes
- Disparities in other environmental barriers

Is active transportation healthy for everyone?

- Disparities in access to bike lanes
- Disparities in other environmental barriers
- Environmental barriers may weaken the health impacts of cycling

Is active transportation healthy for everyone?

- Disparities in access to bike lanes
- Disparities in other environmental barriers
- Environmental barriers may weaken the health impacts of cycling

→ Critical need: Examine health tradeoffs through the lens of social equity

Examining health tradeoffs

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)



 Associations between bike lanes and bicycle commuting **stronger** in more advantaged places

- Associations between bike lanes and bicycle commuting **stronger** in more advantaged places
- Potential associations with **gentrification** (problematic even if not causal)

- Associations between bike lanes and bicycle commuting **stronger** in more advantaged places
- Potential associations with **gentrification** (problematic even if not causal)

→ Critical needs: Address non-infrastructure barriers and proactively address gentrification concerns



Thank you!

Lindsay M. Braun, PhD

Assistant Professor Department of Urban and Regional Planning University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Imbraun@Illinois.edu

Illinois Transportation and Highway Engineering (T.H.E.) Conference February 25, 2020