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# Abstract

Active travel is a key element to achieve robust and healthy urban transportation polycultures. As analysis of transportation needs in cities shifts from a focus on mobility to accessibility, the need to assess accessibility by cycling and walking has become increasingly pressing. The distinguishing features of these modes – lower speeds, shorter trips, potentially different purposes compared to motorized trips – means that the data inputs required for accessibility analysis are not necessarily the same as those used for the study of accessibility for motorized travel. The objective of this review is to assess the sources of data and data needs to implement active accessibility analysis. Walking-specific and cycling-specific geographic accessibility measures and data applied within recently published literature are reviewed. Walking and cycling accessibility measures are compared in terms of the types of metrics, the origins and destinations considered, geographic scales, and travel time or distance calculations. In comparing approaches for walking versus cycling, this report also highlights possible considerations, challenges, and questions that emerge when considering the future of active travel accessibility-based analysis. The discussion in this review is centered on the Canadian context but the lessons may be more broadly applicable to other national contexts.

# Introduction

For decades, transportation planning has been focused on providing mobility for the private car. This is a development model that was first introduced in North America as a solution to problems caused by rapid urbanisation and was later copied elsewhere (Angotti, 1996; Brown et al., 2009). It is now clear that mobility centred on the private car is inefficient, inequitable, and unsustainable that require immediate attention. This includes environmental issues (i.e., climate change; Chapman, 2007), as well as numerous other social (Boschmann and Kwan, 2008; Lucas, 2012, 2019), health (Khreis et al., 2016; Milne, 2012) and equity concerns (Bocarejo and Oviedo, 2012; Martens et al., 2012; Pereira et al., 2017). In order to reduction of car use, the transportation agenda has aimed to focus on creation of mobility polycultures that offer a border menu of transportation alternatives (Lavery et al., 2013; Miller, 2011). Polycultures are resilient and adaptable systems with numerous mobility options, including mobility substitutes such as information technologies and this is more complex than a monoculture in that it requires not only a broader range of mobility technologies, but also a much higher level of coordination among modes and travellers. So, active travel is a key component of efforts in urban areas as they try to achieve more robust and healthy urban transportation polycultures. (Millera 2011, Lavery, Páez et al. 2013, Mella Lira and Paez 2021) .

About cycling , walking and changing from automobile to active mode

Active travel modes including cycling and walking are effective modes for short- and mid-range travel in urban areas that have, over a period of decades, grown to accommodate travel by automobile (Brown, Morris et al. 2009, Wiersma 2020)while treating other modes almost as afterthoughts (Brezina 2020, Koglin 2020, Ruffino and Jarre 2021) On the one hand, there are concerns about the externalities of the current (car-centric) transportation system; on the other hand, there is a growing understanding and awareness of the numerous co-benefits of active mobility in terms of health, efficiency, and social inclusion (Banister, 2005; G€arling et al., 2014; G€ossling et al., 2019; Mueller et al., 2015).Along with a focus on motorized travel, the focus of transportation planning has been to plan for mobility mainly by car. Transportation and land use systems have been designed to produce mobility, and this is reflected in the use of measures of efficiency that ignore the reason for most travel, which is to reach destinations (Handy and Niemeier 1997)

Mostly about accessibility-based planning in transportation

The idea of producing mobility seems intuitive when planning for inexpensive motorized travel, in an era when automobile users have been, as a matter of policy, shielded from paying – and even becoming aware – of the full cost of their travel (Taylor 2006) In recognition of the contradiction of trying to generate mobility while also hoping to reduce the ill effects of mobility, an argument in the transportation literature for decades has been to shift from mobility-based to accessibility-based planning (Handy 1997, Unit 2003)). Transportation accessibility is commonly defined as the potential of transportation-land use systems to generate access to opportunities (Páez, Scott et al. 2012)and conceptually strikes at the heart of wasteful mobility-based planning by focusing on the ability to reach destinations. Despite mixed evidence regarding the adoption of accessibility in planning practice (Boisjoly and El-Geneidy 2017, Proffitt, Bartholomew et al. 2019)there are reasons to believe that the future belongs to accessibility-based planning (Handy 2020)).

The relevance of accessibility-based planning is even more evident when active modes are considered: who would rather make long trips if equivalent destinations could be reached with shorter trips? Not only can pedestrians and cyclists not be shielded from the cost of travel, the effort of reaching destinations is inherently visceral (Hsu and Tsai 2014, Iseki and Tingstrom 2014, Páez, Anjum et al. 2020) As interest in active travel-based accessibility (ATB accessibility) grows globally (e.g.,(Arranz-Lopez, Soria-Lara et al. 2019, Li, Huang et al. 2020, Rosas-Satizabal, Guzman et al. 2020, Ortega, MartÍN et al. 2021) ) transportation scholars have built on decades-worth of accessibility research that mainly focused on motorized travel. In principle, accessibility analysis is sufficiently general to be applicable for ATB accessibility analysis. In practice, it is important to recognize the differences between motorized and active travel, and how they can impact their implementation with a focus on active travel (Iacono et al., 2010). Active modes of transportation absorbed the interest of researchers because they have significant implications and combines unrivalled advantages such as environment, health, and social inclusion (Pucher 2010, Rojas-Rueda, De Nazelle et al. 2011, Rojas-Rueda, de Nazelle et al. 2012, Otero, Nieuwenhuijsen et al. 2018, Koszowski, Gerike et al. 2019, Tinessa, Pagliara et al. 2021). They have been linked to a variety of health benefits. For example, they improve longevity(Hakim, Petrovitch et al. 1998), cognitive function(Weuve, Kang et al. 2004), quality of life(Strawbridge, Cohen et al. 1996, Leveille, Guralnik et al. 1999), and are perceived as cleaner and more efficient sustainable modes of transportation(Bhopal and Unwin 1995) . They also become an excellent alternative for decarbonizing mobility, lowering transportation costs for families, promoting gender equality, building resilient structures, and contributing to the aesthetic value of the environment (Koszowski, Gerike et al. 2019). They also improve accessibility for those who do not have other modes of transportation and aid in the development of local and regional economies. However, compared to motorised travel, active travel is slower, occurs on smaller scales, has less safety due to their higher risk of being severely injured in collisions than motorised vehicle drivers, is used to reach potentially different destinations, and involves costs, such as physical effort, that are typically ignored in motorised travel analysis(Ng, Debnath et al. 2017, Akgün, Dissanayake et al. 2018, Pokorny, Pritchard et al. 2018, Oehl, Brandenburg et al. 2019, Useche, Montoro et al. 2019).

The objective of the present study is to investigate ATB accessibility with a focus on data sources and needs, using Canada as case study. The research is prompted by a recent Canadian project that has been tasked with developing data-driven standards for the analysis of transportation equity (REFERENCE??). The need to propose methods that can be used consistently across regions requires a sound understanding of how analysis and outputs can be conditioned by the data inputs. it is important to acknowledge that other reviews of ATB accessibility measures exist (e.g., Geurs and Van Wee 2004; Iacono, Krizek, and El-Geneidy 2010; Maghelal and Capp 2011; Talen and Koschinsky 2013; Vale et al., 2016). The contribution of this paper is to fill a gap in the literature by focusing on the data required by various measures of ATB accessibility and comparing measures that can be implemented consistently in different contexts, as well as data needs for consistent implementation of the rest.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a review of methods. Section 3 presents a categorization of the required data according to each of the accessibility measurements. Section 4 provides Important considerations and possible challenges for calculating accessibility by active mode; discussions and conclusions are provided in Section 5.

# Background

Transportation planning has emerged as a distinct field centred primarily on mobility, defined as the ease of movement. Mobility indicators such as travel speed and travel time were proposed in this context, with a focus on motorized transportation (Banister, 2008).

The concept of accessibility has long been adopted in both spatial and transportation research to assess the quality and extent of the relationships between spatial development of a certain area and the transportation system serving it. The seminal work of Hansen (1959) defined accessibility as “the potential of opportunities for interaction”, measuring the number and variety of opportunities which can be obtained from a specific location by means of the transportation system. As a result of Hansen's work, researchers began to emphasise the importance of including accessibility as a performance indicator in land use and transportation plans as an alternative to mobility-based transportation planning (Koenig, 1980; Morris et al., 1979; Wachs and Kumagai, 1973). Furthermore, the researchers argued that improved access reflects the network's economic and social benefits, specifically in terms of land value and quality of life (Koenig, 1980; Wachs and Kumagai, 1973). Recently, accessibility has been promoted as a critical component of land use and transportation planning, specifically in terms of social equity, economic development, and environmental impacts (Banister, 2008; Handy, 2002; Straatemeier, 2008; Handy, 2002; Lucas, 2012; Preston and Rajé, 2007).For example, In 2004, Geurs and van Wee deconstructed the concept of accessibility into four elements: (i) land use, which describes the quality, quantity, and spatial distribution of opportunities, such as schools, jobs, hospitals, and recreational facilities as destination places, as well as demand for opportunities at origin places; (ii) transportation, which refers to the transportation system represented by the disutility for a person to travel from an origin to a destination by means of a certain mode of transportation; (iii) time, which accounts for the temporal constraints in terms of the availability of opportunities throughout the day and the available time for people to utilize such kind of opportunities; and iv) individual, which indicates the capabilities (determined by income, education level, travel mode availability, etc.) and needs (determined by age, household situation, etc.) of specific (groups of) persons.

Mobility-based approaches emphasise travel time reduction, whereas accessibility planning aims to provide all individuals with a reasonable travel time to a variety of destinations. As a result, accessibility planning prioritises active and public transportation and incorporates land use policies that shorten distances between activities. (Banister, 2008). The emphasis on different elements of accessibility has resulted in multiple measurement methods and indicators (for example, Geurs and van Wee, 2004; Kelobonye et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2010; Neutens, 2015; Paez et al., 2012; and Vandenbulcke et al., 2009), including proximity, cumulative, gravity, utility-based, and space-time prism models as the dominant approaches. However, there are debates about how to measure this concept (Castiglione et al., 2006; Fan et al., 2012; Wang and Chen, 2015).

Accessibility refers to the ease of access to different destinations which are valuable and can be reached. Access, and thus its mathematical formulation, varies across studies and disciplines. The implementation of access measures varies depending on the research need, mode of transport, and data need, but the activities and land use pattern, as well as the costs of travel over the transport infrastructure that connects it, have always been the determinants of access. So, we distinguish accessibility measures in this paper based on place and individual approaches (Kwan 1998, Horner 2004).Place-based measures focus on the physical separation of key locations, say an origin and potential destinations, whereas individual-based measures take into account some representation of the space-time behavior of individuals () (Harris 2001, Vale 2009, Páez, Gertes Mercado et al. 2010). These two approaches are related, and individual -based measures can in fact be seen as a special case of placed-based measures, where the impedance function and cost are a constant by origin.

In order to identify and measure service deprivation, many researchers have relied

on conventional, place-based accessibility measures. Place-based measures examine the

proximity to desired activity locations from key locations in an individual's daily life,

such as the home or workplace (Miller, 2007).Various place-based measures have been

employed in the literature, including the travel distance to the nearest service location,

the number of services within a particular areal unit (eg census tract) or within a specified cut-off distance, and the gravity-based measures in which the attractiveness of

services decreases with the extent of spatial separation from the origin (Guy, 1983; Tsou

et al, 2005). All these measures tend to use the home or workplace as a static substitute

for an individual. While insightful in many instances and easy to implement in empiri-

cal research, these measures have been criticized on many occasions for their lack of

attention to the interconnectivity between an individual's activities and to the space ^

time constraints implied by both the opening hours of facilities and an individual's

involvement in mandatory activities (eg Hanson and Schwab, 1987; Kitamura et al,

2001; Kwan, 1999; Weber, 2003).

Firstly, accessibility can be measured at the individual level (person-based), or at the location

level (place-based) (Miller, 2005). Whereas person-based metrics focus on the individual component, place-based metrics mainly account for the land use and transport components. The individual component is sometimes included in location-based studies by stratifying population by age group or socio-economic characteristics, and by segmenting destinations (by job types for example) (Fan et al., 2012; Alexandre Legrain et al., 2015; A. Legrain, Buliung et al., 2016; Paez et al., 2010).

NOTE: Write all

Accessibility measures include activity-based measures, distance-based, topological or infrastructure-based measures, utility-based measures, as well as, walkability, and bikeability.

Activity-based measures (includes gravity-based and cumulative opportunities measures) are based on the gravity model and weight opportunities according to a travel impedance function and the accessibility of a place is assessed as the combined effect of the size of opportunities and the cost of traveling to them. Distance-based measures analyze the closest facilities and include: 1) distance to the closest opportunity, 2) the number of opportunities within a defined distance or time, 3) the mean distance to all opportunities, and 4) the mean distance to a defined number of closest opportunities. Infrastructure-based measures are based exclusively on features of the street and transportation network and are insensitive to the location of activities in space. utility-based measures (also designated benefit measures) are developed from microeconomic random utility theory and describe accessibility as the result of a (rational) choice from a set of destination transportation alternatives (Kwan 1998, Halden, Mcguigan et al. 2000, Geurs and Ritsema van Eck 2001, Apparicio, Abdelmajid et al. 2008). Walkability and bikeability measure the number of people, households or jobs distributed over a unit of area or measures how many types—offices, housing, retail, entertainment, services, and so on—are located in a given area (Frank, Engelke et al. 2003, Leslie, Coffee et al. 2007). Indeed, using accurate accessibility measures for walking or cycling trips can assist transport planners in making more rational decisions in infrastructure provision for non-motorized transportation (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Devkota, Dudycha et al. 2012).

Moreover, calculating ATB accessibility in both approaches requires multiple data sets relating to travel behavior and land use. Unfortunately, this has suffered from a lack of appropriate data(Iacono et al., 2010). In particular, little information is available on the geography of walking and cycling behavior such as travel episode origins and destinations, routes, and lengths (durations and distances). So, in most cases, required data is obtained from local/national questionnaires and local maps (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Levine 2010, Devkota, Dudycha et al. 2012, Yang and Diez-Roux 2012, Millward, Spinney et al. 2013) . In addition, available data are extremely location specific or cover a small geographic area and are not adequately covered in most large-scale survey instruments, such as national transportation survey (Ulmer 2003, Achuthan, Titheridge et al. 2007).

# Methods for ATB accessibility analysis

Research about walking and cycling tend to categorize these modes into two different parts of literature (The first is about health and leisure and the second is about transport and land-use), and both have their own viewpoints, data, methods, and policy orientations (Pucher, Dill et al. 2010, Millward, Spinney et al. 2013, Fishman 2016).

Measures of ATB accessibility can either be location-based, focused on the spatial separation to opportunities from specific locations, or individual-based with the incorporation of the space and time constraints of individuals. This review focuses on location-based accessibility. Vale et al. (2016) categorized location-based accessibility measures into four main groups: first, activity-based, which includes gravity-based (also designated attraction-accessibility or potential) and cumulative opportunities measures (also known as isochrones or contour measures). In addition, this measure has been widely used in non-motorized accessibility studies (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Lowry, Callister et al. 2012, Millward, Spinney et al. 2013, Prins, Pierik et al. 2014, Li, Huang et al. 2020); second, topology infrastructure-based, which include topological measures of the network (Hull, Silva et al. 2012, Lundberg 2012); third, distance-based, which include analyses of the closest facilities (Apparicio, Abdelmajid et al. 2008, Sadler, Gilliland et al. 2011), and the last category being utility-based measures which are also known as benefits measures (Geurs and Van Wee 2004, Hunt and Abraham 2006, Vale 2009, El-Geneidy and Levinson 2011).

potential compatibility with regional travel forecasting models is an essential reason for the wide use of location-based measures instead of individual-based measures for active transport mode. So, it is easy to extract travel times from one area to another area using the coded network. moreover, number of potential opportunities are available at the area level (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Saghapour 2017).

There are some limitations of using these measures for active travel modes. first, active travel modes are less sensitive to travel times and levels of network congestion rather than motorized modes. as well, walking and cycling route choices tend to include qualitative, experiential, or difficult to measure factors (Hunt and Abraham 2006, Tilahun, Levinson et al. 2007, Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010). second, measuring active transport accessibility is mostly dependent on travel diary data. besides, The methods applied so far to measure cycling accessibility have not focused on the accessibility of cycling destinations in terms of service areas (Landis, Vattikuti et al. 1997, Harkey, Reinfurt et al. 1998, Harkey, Reinfurt et al. 1998, Landis, Vattikuti et al. 2003). some studies have investigated the level of services such as Bicycle Compatibility Index (BCI) or Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) for a bicycle network. indeed, these measures focused on measuring the performance of a bicycle network using various geometric measures such as the width of the bicycle routes, pavement, route types, and connectivity. Nonetheless, there are other methods that consider bikeability in terms of how accessible different destinations are for bicycles as a transport mode. Such methods measure the potential for cycling using travel behaviour data (Espada and Luk 2011, Wahlgren and Schantz 2012, Rybarczyk and Gallagher 2014, Milakis, Cervero et al. 2015) .

## Activity-based measures

Activity-based measures include both gravity-based (also known as Hansen-type (Hansen 1959) and cumulative opportunities measures. Gravity-based measures designated attraction-accessibility or potential and consider the number of opportunities weighted by the cost of traveling to them - using a travel impedance function that values closer opportunities higher. The same researchers underlined the importance of choosing a suitable impedance function and it can be observed that a large variety of functions are applied. Commonly used functions are power, negative exponential, logistic and Gaussian functions (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Lowry, Callister et al. 2012, Vasconcelos and Farias 2012, Vale and Pereira 2017). More recently Vale and Pereira (2017) conducted a study testing 20 pedestrian accessibility measures and identified the modified Gaussian and exponential function as the most robust ones for modeling walking accessibility. Cumulative opportunities (also known as isochrones or contour measures), measures count the number of opportunities within a defined catchment area.

Gravity-based and cumulative opportunities measures are specific instances of a more general formulation (Páez, Scott et al. 2012):

This equation gives the accessibility from the origin location i, to opportunities of type k, from the perspective of individual p. This measure of accessibility is a function of the number of opportunities W of type k at location j, and the cost of moving between i and j as perceived/experienced by person p. Function f() defines a kernel around location i, usually symmetric if cij is given by Euclidean distance, but not necessarily, for instance if cij is measured over a network. Activity-based measures are useful when opportunities are complementary (e.g., jobs, people, services, parks) and when access to more opportunities and being closer (with gravity-based models) is advantageous.

## Distance-based measures

Distance-based measures consider accessibility in terms of proximity, either by travel distance, time, or a generalized cost measure between locations. A distance measure analyses the closest facilities, including 1) distance to the closest opportunity, 2) the number of opportunities within a defined distance or time, 3) the mean distance to all opportunities, and 4) the mean distance to a defined number of closest opportunities (Apparicio, Abdelmajid et al. 2008). These measures are applicable when destinations are regarded as substitutes for one another (i.e., hospitals, transit stops, convenience stores etc.), under the assumption that individuals want to access the nearest facility.

Distance is considered as the travel impedance and four types of distances are usually used in distance-based accessibility measures: 1) Euclidean distance, that has been mainly used for walkability measures, particularly in health studies (Apparicio, Abdelmajid et al. 2008). 2) Manhattan distance, 3) shortest network distance (Lundberg 2012, Hochmair 2015) 4) shortest network time (Pearce 2006, Páez, Scott et al. 2012). As well, there are two different ways for measuring distance, first calculates the distance to the closest facility of each type - The first method calculates the distance from each zone centroid to the closest or the first n closest facilities (e.g. medical centers).and second, calculates the distance to all facilities close by. This approach is based on floating catchment areas that finds the closest facility regardless of distance and measures the distance from each zone centre to the closest or the first n closest different facilities (e.g. medical centres, shopping centres, etc.).

Distance to nearest location is calculated based on (1):

In this equation, is accessibility of zone i to location of type p, is set of locations of type p, and is distance (or travel time for a given mode) from i to location j in set 𝐿𝑝. This measure is consistent with an extremely simple location model in which the nearest location is always chosen with probability 1.0. (2)

In equation 2, is the probability of choosing location j for purpose p given that one is located in zone i. This measure has two limitations, first, doesn’t consider the size/attractiveness of locations and second, doesn’t investigate the cumulative effect of multiple accessible locations. So, it is not recommended to calculate accessibility using this method as an independent measure.

## Topological or infrastructure-based measures

Topological-based measures consider accessibility in terms of the street network, rather than access from origins to destinations. Topology measures may evaluate network connectivity, the quality of infrastructure within a catchment area, or some combination of connectivity and infrastructure quality. Indeed, this measure emphasizes on infrastructure evaluation. Such approaches are applicable in the context of planning – for example, in identifying priorities for development, or identifying potential impacts of redevelopment.

There are three types of topological measure: the first, this group evaluate the level of service (LOS) within a floating catchment area (FCA)(Sisson 2006). The second type is similar the first one. however, this one used a pre-defined spatial unit to evaluate LOS, and this is based on the segment instead of the point (Emery and Crump 2011, Horacek, White et al. 2012, Lowry, Callister et al. 2012). The third one is very different, since traffic is not considered as a relevant parameter (Hoedl, Titze et al. 2010, Zielstra and Hochmair 2011, Jabbari, Fonseca et al. 2021). These measures are based on and the evaluation of network segments, infrastructure characteristics, and include variables such as sidewalk or bike path availability, quality, and length among others.

## Utility-based measures

utility-based measures evaluate accessibility based on individual preferences and the log-sum of discrete choice models applied to destination choice analysis (Ben-Akiva and Lerman 2021). This measure, which is known as benefits measures, can better represent individual accessibility than location-based measures. Utility-based measure can be calculated using two methods:

1. Assume that a decision-maker perceives the utility of a destination as: 𝑈𝑗 = 𝑉𝑗 + 𝜀𝑗 where 𝜀𝑗 is the individual’s idiosyncratic deviation in terms of how s/he perceives the utility of alternative j relative to the population average utility, 𝑉𝑗. The person chooses the alternative that generates the maximum perceived utility, 𝑈𝑗. Under very common assumptions, the probability that j is the maximum utility alternative and so is chosen is given by the multinomial logit (MNL) model (Train 2009):

In this equision, 𝑉𝑗 = βZj: The systematic utility of alternative j

Zj: Vector of explanatory variables

Β: (Row) vector of parameters

1. The actual perceived maximum utility is unobservable, but, for the case of the MNL model, it can be shown (Ben-Akiva & Lerman, 1985) that the expected maximum utility (𝐼𝑖𝑝) associated with this choice is given by:

That is, it is the natural logarithm of the denominator of the logit choice model (sometimes referred to as the “logsum” term). Further, it can also be shown that this expected maximum utility is the consumer’s surplus for this choice. Thus it is a standard measure of economic benefit. Given this, Ben-Akiva and Lerman (1985) argue that it also provides a behaviourally and economically sound definition of accessibility: accessibility for a given activity is the expected utility that would be derived from participation in this activity, which is also the consumer surplus associated with this participation. That is:

𝐴𝑖𝑝 =

In the following, Tables 1 and 2 have categorized recent studies based on the accessibility by walking and cycling. However, Vale et al. (2016) found relatively few studies examining cycling-specific accessibility in comparison to walking. For a comprehensive review of all 84 papers on walking and cycling accessibility (published by September 2013) refer to Vale et al. (2016).

**Table 1.** Studies employing cycling-specific accessibility measures.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of metric | Study | Measure | Travel time / distance threshold | Origins / Destinations | Geographic scale | Travel time / distance calculation |
| Activity-based | Murphy and Owen (2019) | * **Cumulative job opportunities** * ‘Access gap’: comparing LTS 1-4 * Weighted accessibility by number of workers | 20 mins  (Tested 5 to 60 mins) | Census block centroids | Neighbourhoods -> city level | Network travel time  15 km/h |
| Faghih Imani, Miller et al. (2019) | * **Cumulative opportunities: jobs & population access** * Calculated isochrones for LTS 1-4 | 30 mins | Dissemination area centroids | Dissemination areas | Network travel time |
| Wu, Lu et al. (2019) | * **Gravity-based measure: accessibility to POIS at metro stations** * Lognormal distance-decay function (confirmed using distribution of bicycle-metro trip data) | 2.5 km | Metro stations *(origins)*  POIs *(destinations)* | 2.5 km buffer | Euclidean distance |
| Distance-based | Houde, Apparicio et al. (2018) | * **Proximity of bike paths:** * 1. Network distance to nearest section of cycling network * 2. Network distance to cyclist-only bike path | - | Census tract centroids *(origins)*  Bike paths *(destinations)* | Census tracts | Network distance |
| Pérez, Buck et al. (2017) | 1)the dedicated cycling network - The distance from census tract centroid to **nearest bike network** segment was measured to estimate the accessibility of each tract.  2) level of traffic stress (**LTS network**) was used to assess accessibility in the district. |  | census tract centroid to nearest bike network | The District of Columbia | Euclidean distance |
| Topology-based | Mekuria (2012) | * **Network connectivity by LTS 1-4:** * Percent trips connected * Percent nodes connected | - | Home-to-work O-D pairs from regional trip table  Land parcel ‘attraction strength’ (size and land-use attraction) *(destinations)* | Census blocks | Network |

**Table 2.** Studies examining walking-specific accessibility

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of Metric | Study | Measure | Travel time / distance threshold | Origins / Destinations | Geographic scale | Travel time / distance calculation |
| Activity-based | Cheng, Caset et al. (2019) | * **Cumulative opportunities: chess/card rooms and urban parks for older and younger adults** * Park spaces weighted by their size | Adaptive distance thresholds (based on location and socio-economic variables) | locations from travel survey *(origins)*  Parks and chess/card rooms *(destinations)* | Traffic analysis zones | Network distance |
|  | Reyes, Páez et al. (2014) | * **Cumulative opportunities to urban parks for children** * Park spaces weighted by their size * 1. Accessibility based on all individual attributes from travel survey * 2. Accessibility based on scenario profiles (gender, age, income etc.) | Based on statistical model of travel behavior | Locations from household travel survey  Rasterized parks 25x25m *(destinations)* | Dissemination areas  (Weighted average) | Euclidean distance |
|  | García-Palomares, Gutiérrez et al. (2013) | * **Access quality indicator for metro stations: population served** * Access by age groups * Distance-decay function by age group | 1500m  & Distance thresholds calculated for different age groups | Metro stations *(origins)*  Transport-zone level populations | 1500m metro station catchment areas | Network distance |
|  | Papa, Carpentieri et al. (2018) | * **Contour accessibility measure: bus catchment areas** * Number of inhabitants served by age group * Catchment areas calculated with and without network slope | Dependent on frequency of bus service | Bus stops | Hexagonal cells 50m | Network distance  Walking speeds dependent on age |

## Walkability measures

Walkability indices can be defines based on the both the social and physical environment, a predictive indicator of active travel and physical activity to access facilities; based on indicator of the usability of the built environment to people (Frank, Andresen et al. 2004, Frank, Sallis et al. 2006)who walk to different destinations and for different purposes (i.e., from a clear origin to a clear set of destinations) (Saelens and Handy 2008, Blečić, Cecchini et al. 2015, Vale, Saraiva et al. 2015, Dovey and Pafka 2020). There is a difference between gravity- and distance-based accessibility measures and the walkability index so that for measuring walkability, area characteristics around the origins and destinations are also taken into account in the calculation, but still, this index does not consider route characteristics.

Walkability measures are divided into 4 categories including Frank’s Walkability Index, Walk score, Objective Walkability Index (OWI), and Graz Walkability Index. In the Frank’s index, a walkability score is calculated by summing the normalized scores across factors that are identified based on a definition of the concept of walkability. This index uses residential density, land use mix, retail floor area ratio, and intersection density as variables to measure walkability. Then Grasser, Van Dyck et al. (2013) improved Frank’s index for assessing Europe cities by considering population density, household density, and entropy index for land-use mix, and three-way intersection density in order to construct the Graz walkability index (Grasser, Van Dyck et al. 2013). In addition, some other theory-based methods such as Objective Walkability Index (OWI) are also proposed. Weiss, Maantay et al. (2010) constructed the OWI, which includes street connectivity, land use mix, pedestrian safety, neighborhood aesthetics, neighborhood safety, and neighborhood infrastructure. In 2011, Duncan, Aldstadt et al. (2011) developed Walk Score for measuring walkability of neighborhoods. Indeed, Walk Score recognizes eight types of walking attractors: Errands, Culture, Grocery, Park, Dining and Drinking, School, and Shopping. Walk Score can be assessed for any location worldwide, however, locations outside the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand should be additionally validated, since the geo-located data is not always complete (Duncan, Aldstadt et al. 2011, WalkScore 2020).

most of the studies assessed walkability using two Frank’s index and walk score (Frank, Schmid et al. 2005, Frank, Sallis et al. 2006, Frank, Sallis et al. 2010, Vale, Saraiva et al. 2015). The major difference between these approaches is that Walk Score uses a gravity-based methodology. Opportunities are weighted using a distance decay function, while the Walkability Index is based on a cumulative opportunities measure. In the following, Table 3 provides a summary of this categorization.

**Table 3.** Studies examining walkability

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Methods** | **Author** | **Variables** | **Data** | **Descriptions** |
| ***Methods based on a theory-driven approach*** | | | | |
| **Frank’s Walkability**  **Index** | Frank, Schmid et al. (2005), Frank, Sallis et al. (2010) | * Net residential/ Population density * Retail floor area ratio * Intersection density * Land use mix | * **travel data** from both Census Journey to Work for both regions * **Household Travel Survey Data**   census-based **demographic** data |  |
| Manaugh and El-Geneidy (2011) | * Net residential/ Population density * Retail floor area ratio * Intersection density * Land use mix | * **Retail information** *(shopping and school)* was obtained from the Dun and Bradstreet business database and combined with a weighted intersection index. * used a database of over 100,000 postal code points from Walkscore.[[1]](#footnote-1) * **Household level data** and travel behavior characteristics are obtained from the 2003 Montréal Origin–Destination survey. * census tract level **demographic data** derived from Statistics Canada | * nine models were generated for each trip purpose using a different walkability measure in every run (**Walkscore, walk opportunities, the WI at four scales and three sizes for the pedshed connectivity measure**) * The walkability index generated at **four scales:** 400, 800 and 1200 m network buffers as well as at the census tract level. * used a simple **gravity-based measure** to weight nearby locations higher than those more distant. |
| Adhikari, Delgado-Ron et al. (2021) | * residential density * the commercial floor-to-area ratio * land-use mix * intersection density | * **demographic characteristics** of participants | * The **walkability index** uses **1 km** pedestrian “walksheds” that map pedestrian-accessible roads around each postal code centroid. * Each walkshed corresponds to approximately **10–15 min of walking** time, a commonly used time frame to assess perceived proximity to amenities and services. |
| Azmi, Karim et al. (2013) | * Mixed-use planning * Density * Street connectivity | * data was gathered by using the **questionnaire survey** * asking the **accessibility of residents walk from their home to community facilities or services** provided within the walkable catchment * indicated **the amount of time** they thought it would take for them to walk from their home to the nearest destination. | * the type of **community facilities or services** selected was based on the availability of the services provided within a radius of **400 meter** (approximately 5 minute of walking) * There are a total of **13 community facilities and services** such as grocery store/supermarket, park or recreational facility (indoor or outdoor), elementary school, other school, community center, restaurant or other places, bank, medical clinic/pharmacy, personal shop (laundry, salon), workplace, bus stop, post office and place of worship. |
| Liao, van den Berg et al. (2020) | * The **variables** of this section are divided into **four parts**: * ***density*** * ***facilities*** * ***green space*** * ***land use mix*** | * as a **source of walking frequency** data, the Dutch national travel survey. * **neighborhood data** as a source for **socio-demographic** and **physical neighborhood** variables and used as **control variables** include ***gender***, *age*, ***income status, work status, household status, and migration background***. * All **walkability variables** were derived from the Esri-open postcode plane and the CBS data. | * ***density*** variables: population density, intersection density, and business property density * ***facilities*** variables: a range of facilities the **distance to the nearest facilit**y (average distance from the center of the neighborhood) and **the number of facilities** available within a 1 km radius (from the center of the neighborhood) * ***green space*** variables: total area of different types of **open green space and recreational space**. * ***land use mix*** variables: the **separate lower-level land-use** variables in the form of a percentage of the total land covered by the land-use were used |
| Arellana, Alvarez et al. (2021) | * intersection density * land use entropy score * population density * commercial density | * latest **household Origin Destination** **survey**. * **Land use data**, the location of **commercial** zones, the **population**, and the **characteristics of the walking** **trips** from each zone (TAZ). | * Calculated **potential accessibilit**y. * The measure evaluates the **access to shop, job, study, and institutional opportunitie**s |
| Ruiz-Padillo, Pasqual et al. (2018) | * Public Security * Traffic Safety * Convenience and attractiveness: * Street connectivity * Destination's proximity (number of shops and services) * Mix of uses proximity (number of shops and services) * attractiveness * Characters of the roots: * Pavement Quality * Pavement width * Slope | * Census tracts were used that including size and number of households | all census tracts were classified according to **three variables**:   * ***motorization rate*** * ***density of commercial and service establishments*** * ***average slope*** |
| **Walk Score** (Walk Score calculates a score by determining the **walking distance to amenities** in nine different amenity categories) | Duncan, Aldstadt et al. (2011) | * Walking distance to amenities * Intersection density metrics * Average block length | * **Google AJAX** Search application program interface (API) provides data for the Walk Score. |  |
| **Graz Walkability Index** (based on American city and Frank's walkability index) | Grasser, van Dyck et al. (2017) | * Net residential/ Population density/ household density * Intersection density * Land use mix (entropy index for land-use mix) | * Outcome data were derived from the representative cross-sectional survey * **Walking** (for at least 10 min) and **cycling** (in the warm season) | present study reported the results of the **1000 m circular buffer** and the **1500 m street network** buffer[[2]](#footnote-2). |

## Bikeability measures

Bikeability can be defined as the ability of a person to bike or the ability of the urban landscape to be biked or as a baseline definition of the likelihood that individuals or groups of people will choose the bicycle as a mode of transport or leisure (Krizek 2009, Winters, Brauer et al. 2013, Nielsen and Skov-Petersen 2018) .However, It should be noted that the bikeability index described by several scientists: in 2012, Lowry, Callister et al. (2012) explained the Bikeability index as the comfort and convenience of an entire bikeway network for accessing important destinations. Then they referd that this index is the only methodology exclusively dedicated to bicycle travel (Lowry, Callister et al. 2012). In additional, The Bikeability Index described by Winters, Brauer et al. (2013)includes the three basic measures, but adds the length of bicycle routes, slope, and the separation from car traffic. Each variable is given a score of 1 to 10, which is then summed to produce the final score.

Explaining the Bikeability of an environment has included the following characteristics:

* Single principles of the townscape or the infrastructure, such as bicycle tracks, crossings, and parking facilities, which are referred to by Lowry, Callister et al. (2012) as ‘bicycle suitability’.
* Neighbourhoods are delineated based on airline/Euclidian distance rather than network distance (Greenberg and Renne 2005, Nielsen and Skov-Petersen 2018).
* Explicit polygon features generated around specific trajectories of individual respondents – e.g., as recorded by GPS. Such features can be purely geometric, such as buffers or ellipsoids, or be based on the topology of a transport network (Madsen, Schipperijn et al. 2014, Frank, Fox et al. 2017) .
* Connected infrastructures as a functional component of entire towns and urban fabrics (Lowry, Callister et al. 2012). According to Lowry, Callister et al. (2012), this is in fact what covers the term ‘Bikeability’. In the following, Table 4 prepares some of the studies that used bikeability index.

Table 4: Studies examining bikeability

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **Study area** | **Measure** | **Data** | **Descriptions** |
| Lowry, Callister et al. (2012) | Moscow, Idaho | * proposed calculation for **bikeability** was developed on the basis of a common accessibility equation (Hansen's model). * calculation finds the **shortest routes** between zone i and every destination j | * bikeway is any roadway where bicycle travel is permitted regardless of the presence of a bike lane * Complete entire bikeway network and important destinations in the case study community * only arterials, collectors, and shared-use paths were considered part of the major bikeway network. | * Assessment of **bikeability** considers comfort and safety of the entire bikeway network for access to important destinations. * **impedance functions** were estimated based on a negative exponential function. * bikeability was assessed for all **commercial destinations** |
| Nielsen and Skov-Petersen (2018) | Denmark | * presented a micro-level analysis of the **Bikeability** **variables** included density/accessibility,   infrastructure provision and terrain measured   * The **accessibility** was based on the **shortest path network** **distance** from trip origins. | * **cycling data** obtained from the Danish National Travel survey * a **classification** **of all roads** and paths into **seven** classes is provided: roads without bicycle infrastructure, roads with bicycle lanes, roads with bicycle paths (protection by kerb and/or separating strip), fully separated bicycle and foot paths, fully separated foot paths, roads without access for pedestrians or bicycles, and roads without public access. * the **number of residents, jobs, retail jobs, schools, high schools, and further education** were counted within 1 km, 2 km, 3 km, 4 km, and 5 km of each trip origin and added to the travel survey dataset. | * The survey's account of **cycling** includes cycling as the main mode of transport as well as cycling as a stage mode, e.g., connecting to public transport and leisure cycling without a destination purpose. * The **average slope** of the terrain within the same distances (Euclidian measure) was applied. |
| McNeil (2011) | Portland, Oregon | * assessing a neighborhood’s bicycle **accessibility** or “**bikeability**” on the basis of 20-min neighborhood for bicycles. * Using **a scoring method** in order to assessment the bikeability, | * the 2009 National Household Transportation Survey * Geocoded data for **parks, schools, libraries, and transit connections** (light rail stops and bus lines) were obtained from Metro’s Regional Land Information System. * **Business address data** for other destination types were acquired through a data clearinghouse, Reference USA. | * this research focused on **home-based utilitarian** trips and excluded any trips to and from work. * Business addresses were gathered and geocoded for all **childcare providers, grocery stores, clothing stores, general goods stores, beauty services** (e.g., salons, barbers), **banks, mail services** (e.g., post offices, private mail providers), **laundries and cleaners, gyms, general entertainment** (e.g., bowling, performance venues), **drinking establishments, movie theaters, restaurants, coffee and snack shops, and religious organizations**. |
| Saghapour (2017) |  | * Introducing a **new index** for measuring **bikeability;**   **Cycling Accessibility Index (CAI)** was developed for quantifying cycling accessibility using the **travel distance as impedance** along with **cycling catchments** within local areas in metropolitan area  Using **gravity-based measures** of accessibility.   * **Network models** are applied to identify acceptable cycling catchments as well as an **Origin-Destination (O-D) cost matrix** | **database** included **urban centres**, significant **buildings**, **landmarks**, **public spaces**, **community facilities** and **indigenous locations.**- considered as destinations and categorized into **four groups** of **activities.**   * A datab`ase of **Mesh Blocks** from the 2011 Census and contained the **total usual resident population** and **total number of dwellings.** * *Point of Interests (POIs):* * Education Centres * Health and Care Facilities * Retails and Recreation Centres * Community Services | * **Service area** and OD-cost matrix analysis was undertaken for each set of destinations separately: * ***4 km buffers*** were calculated for *education centres* and health and care facilities * used the **median desirable travel** **time/distance** * uses the speed of **16 km/h** which has been adopted from the Austroads network operation planning framework * the **median desirable travel time** was defined as **20 minutes** for community services |

# A framework for assessing data sources and needs

For calculating accessibility in active transport mode, multiple data sources are required. After reviewing most of active travel mode articles, we have divided the data used to calculate accessibility in these studies into 7 different categories, which are: Travel data (trips), Users data (Socio-economic and personal data), Origin- destination, Cycling and walking network, Spatial data (boundary, land use, postal code, . . . ), additional data (such as Traffic data, weather data, slope, Level of Traffic Stress, impedance value, speed ). Table 5, shows required data based on the each measure.

Table 5: Required data according to each measure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data / Methods** | **Travel Data** | **Users Data** | **Origin- destination Data** | **Cycling and walking network** | **Spatial data** | **additional data** |
| Activity-based | Travel data is usually obtained from surveys and includes information about each trip such as duration, start point, end point, origin and destination. | travel behavior characteristics such as age, gender, income, can be considered if the data are available | The origin and destinations spatial data or a database of POIs that is obtained from local map. Indeed, a database of POIs consists of the location of all of the facilities such as home, workplace, parks, schools, groceries, etc. | Walking and cycling network data are required for calculating time or distances (using network analysis or nearest distance) that can be obtained from both the OpenStreetMap and the local government data portals. | spatial data of statistical areas such as blocks, mesh, zones, areas, etc. This data set includes some information such as population, number of dwellings, employment data, etc. This dataset is required for calculating accessibility in each area. | * Impedance functions are required that are usually estimated based on a negative exponential function and it is mostly based on the travel time. * Slope can be considered for calculating accessibility. |
| Distance-based | ----- | ----- | Required to calculating the shortest distance to nearest facilities. | Required to calculating nearest distance or time to facilities using network analysis. | Required to census tracts data. |  |
| infrastructure-based | ----- | ----- | ----- | Walking and cycling network data are required | Spatial data of essential services or origins/destinations are required. For example, grocery stores, hospitals, schools, bikeshare systems etc |  |
| Utility-based | Travel data is required. | travel behavior characteristics are required such as age, gender, etc. | ----- | Walking and cycling network data are required | Spatial data of essential services |  |
| Walkability | Travel data is usually obtained from surveys and includes information about each trip such as duration, start point, end point, origin and destination. | travel behavior characteristics are required such as age, gender, income, car availability and etc. | The origin and destinations database is required | Walking and cycling network data are required | Spatial data of net residential/ Population density, Retail floor area, Intersection density, and Land use mix are required |  |
| Bikeability | Travel data is required and includes information about each trip such as duration, start point, end point, origin and destination. | - | The origin and destinations database is required . | Walking and cycling network data are required for calculating time or distances (using network analysis or nearest distance) | spatial data of statistical areas such as blocks, mesh, zones, areas, etc. is required for calculating accessibility in each area. | Impedance functions are required that are usually estimated based on a negative exponential function and it is mostly based on the travel time. |

# Data needs and sources

## Travel data (trips)

Travel data provides information about the trips, including the mode of travel, duration of travel, and trip origins and destinations. This data can obtain from General social survey (GSS) for all over the Canada. The (GSS)-time uses is conducting every 5 years and the last survey was done in 2015. This survey monitors changes in time use to better understand how Canadians spend and manage their time. This dataset contains travel time data of Many of the Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) and non-CMA areas all over Canada. CMAs are including St. John’s, Halifax, Saint John, Montreal, Quebec City, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary, Edmonton, and Vancouver. and the non-CMA areas of each of the ten provinces were also grouped to form ten more strata. In addition, this dataset contains 301 bicycle and 4236 walking trips. Each trip contains pumID, start time, end time, duration, origin and destination.

In addition to the general social survey, travel time data can be obtained for the cities of Toronto and Montreal from the Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) and the Autorité régionale de transport métropolitain (ARTM) survey. The 2016 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) was conducted on behalf of 22 local, regional, provincial and transit operating agencies in Greater Toronto and surrounding regions. the TTS database for the city of Toronto includes Travel data (e.g., mode, trip length), personal data (e.g., age, gender), household data (e.g., number of persons, income), and transit data (e.g., access distance, access mode to transit). As well, the Autorité régionale de transport métropolitain (ARTM) is an origin-destination survey and one of the most critical transportation studies in Quebec that has been carried out every five years since 1970. Data are collected for each household (home location, size, number of cars), each person in the household (age, gender, driving license ownership, main occupation, public transit monthly pass ownership), and each trip made by each person of 5 years and older (departure time, origin and destination locations, trip purpose, mode sequence, and others).

## Users data (Socio-economic and personal data)

Demographic variables of users including age, gender, and the number of households can be obtained from General Social Survey (GSS) in 2015. In addition, the Statistics Canada population census provides a statistical overview of various geographic areas all over Canada such as provinces and territories, census metropolitan areas (CMAs), census agglomerations (CAs), Census divisions (CDs), etc in 2021 and includes different variables for example number of population, age, and gender (StatisticsCanada 2021).

## Origin- destination data

Various articles examine bicycle and walking trips to different purposes. the most important destinations are educational facilities, cultural and Art Facilities, recreational and Sports Facilities, healthcare facilities, grocery stores and markets, services and government offices (such as banks, post offices, and insurance company, etc ), work, and home. Origins and destinations data of cycling and walking trips all over Canada can be obtained from two sources of General Social Survey (GSS)-time uses data and The Linkable Open Data Environment (LODE).

In the GSS database, different travel destinations and locations are considered and each location is identified with a specific code, as follows: home or on the property, someone else’s home or property, work or school, in the neighbourhood, Outdoors, Grocery store, other stores or mall, Library, museum or theatre, Sports center, field or arena, Restaurant, bar or club, Place of worship, medical, dental or another health clinic, and Elsewhere.

In addition, the Linkable Open Data Environment (LODE) is an exploratory initiative that aims at enhancing the use and harmonization of open microdata primarily from municipal, provincial and federal sources. It has been compiled by the Centre for Special Business Projects (CSBP) at Statistics Canada in 2020. This database includes variables such as address, postal code, city, province and latitude and longitude of each facility and includes a Canada-wide Open Database of educational facilities (this database covers facilities such as early childhood education, kindergarten, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary institutions, and specific vocational training centers. The database does not include virtual educational institutions.), healthcare facilities (including ambulatory health care services, hospitals, and nursing and residential care facilities), cultural and art facilities (such as arts or cultural centers, artists, festival sites, galleries, heritage or historic site, library or archive, museum, theatre/performance and concert hall, and miscellaneous), and recreational and sports facilities (including trails(such as urban and rural trails or pathways for walking, hiking, or biking), sports fields, arenas (facilities where sports and/or recreational activities take place), athletic parks, beaches, casinos, community centers, gyms, marinas, parks and green spaces, playgrounds, pools, race tracks, ice rinks, skate parks, splash pads, stadiums, miscellaneous), and Businesses (this database contains addresses of business, name, type of business and locations).

## Cycling and walking networks

Cycling and walking networks can be obtained from different sources such as Can-BICS, open street map (OSM), and municipal open data.

Can-BICS is a classification system of five broad bicycle facilities assigned to three categories: high, medium, and low comfort, based on the facility’s contribution to user safety and comfort while cycling. 1) High comfort includes low-stress routes that are comfortable for most people, including those of all ages and abilities, with a record for best safety. for example, cycle track, local street bikeway, and bike path. 2) medium comfort is low- or medium-stress routes that are comfortable for some people, but whose safety requires careful design, such as multi-use paths (A two-way paved path shared by cyclists, pedestrians and other users). 3) low comfort bikeways are high-stress routes that are comfortable for few people, with little or no additional safety, compared to no bicycle facility, such as painted bike lanes that are designated by bicycle and diamond pavement markings and signs as exclusively for cyclists. And 4) non-conforming bicycle facilities do not meet minimum Can-BICS standards, such as non-conforming - trail (these are multi-use trails with unpaved surface), non-conforming – major road (shared lanes on major roads provide connectivity), and non-conforming - other.

Can-BICS measured bicycle infrastructure for all communities in Canada, at the neighborhood level, using open data sources such as OpenStreetMap (OSM). This data was completed in 15 pilot cities such as Edmonton, Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Halifax, Regina, Saint John, Victoria, Canmore, Cornwall, Courtenay, Whistler, and Whitehorse.

Another source for obtaining cycling and walking networks is OpenStreetMap (OSM). This dataset is a collaborative global map that using for active transportation researches. OSM considered cycle lanes, tracks and sidewalks. A cycle lane lies within the roadway itself (on-road), whereas a cycle track is separate from the road (off-road). Tracks are typically separated from the road by e.g. curbs, parking lots, grass verges, trees, etc. as well, trails line that indicates the paths or routes suitable for walking, hiking, bicycling, and other outdoor activities from 2015 to 2019 can be obtained from scholars Geoportal.

As well, municipal open data is a standard source of bicycling infrastructure data that city governments are making this spatial data for bicycling infrastructure. In Canada, some cities have this dataset such as Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, etc. However, open data of different cities use different definitions for bicycling infrastructure, and they may have different levels of timeliness, completeness, and documentation (Schoner and Levinson 2014). For example, bicycle facilities the City of Toronto Open Data portal consists of a high-resolution geospatial data set with attributes accumulated from several sources of cycle tracks or bike lanes, road classification (local, collector, minor arterial, etc.), number of lanes, directions, stop signs and signalized intersections. (City of Toronto, 2017).

## Spatial data (boundary, land use, postal code, etc)

Spatial data such as boundary, land use, postal code, origin and destinations and etc can be obtained from scholars Geoportal and open street map (OMP).

scholars Geoportal has different shape file layers such as Land Cover Region (including seven land use categories: commercial; government and institutional; open area; parks and recreational; residential; resource and industrial; or waterbody in 2019), education Point (includes the point locations of elementary schools, high schools, colleges, cégeps and universities in 2020.There is also additional information about teaching languages and grade levels), enhanced Points of Interest (EPOI) in 2019, which indicates the locations of business and recreational points of interest across Canada in 2020, Healthcare (HCR) that contains the location of hospitals, long-term care facilities, outpatient clinics, nursing stations, and community health centres in 2020, Tourist Attractions Point that indicates the point locations for various tourist sites (such as National, Provincial, and Municipal parks, Art Galleries, Historic Sites, Museums, Science Centres, Tourist Information Booths, and Zoos) in 2020, Park sports field point in 2019 across Canada, Cinemas Point, Religious Buildings Point, Retail Point that indicates the locations shopping centers and department stores in 2020, and accommodations Point such as hotels, motels, campgrounds, inns, hostels, resorts, etc., in Canada.

# Important considerations and possible challenges

## Travel time/distance thresholds

Selecting an appropriate cut-off distance for travel has been acknowledged as an important step that has the potential to significantly impact results. Different distance thresholds should apply to both cycling and walking, however, there remains considerable variation among the threshold values applied within each mode.

Some analyses choose to vary thresholds according to the destination type, or by population group. For example, Saghapour (2017) use a 10-minute travel time for retail and recreation centres and a 20-minute travel time for cycling to community services. Applying the same threshold to all age groups also disregards the fact that certain groups (for example, seniors and children) may travel slower or require greater effort to travel the same distance. Although applicable to both cycling and walking, this distinction by age group has only been applied among walking measures. In the following, Tables 5 shows the thresholds of bicycle and walking travel time and distance in different studies.

Table5: Thresholds of bicycle and walking travel time and distance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Distance/Time thresholds** | |
| **walking trips** | |
| Neilson and Fowler (1972), O'Neill, Ramsey et al. (1992), Hsiao, Lu et al. (1997), Murray and Wu (2003), Zhao, Chow et al. (2003), Kimpel, Dueker et al. (2007), Gutiérrez and García-Palomares (2008) | The most common standard measure of walking distance to transit stops and stations has been **400 m** (0.25 miles). |
| Lam and Morrall (1982) | In Calgary, Canada, observed a **median walking distance** to bus stops of **292 m,** while **the average** was **327 m** and the 75th percentile, **450 m**. |
| O'Sullivan and Morrall (1996) | distinguished between walking to light-rail transit stations in the suburbs and in the central business district. They found **an average distance** of 649 m and a 75th percentile equal to 840 m in the former, while **the average distance** was 326 metres and the 75th percentile was 419 metres in the latter (Calgary, Canada) |
| Arasan, Rengaraju et al. (1996) | an average critical trip time is **20 min for walking**. |
| Nicholls (2001), Smoyer‐Tomic, Hewko et al. (2004) | used a distance of **0.8 km** as a reasonable threshold for walking trips (the threshold is not specific to a population group) |
| Zhao, Chow et al. (2003) | in southeast Florida, the number of riders walking over half a mile **(800m) was negligible**. |
| Van Herzele and Wiedemann (2003) | Maximum distance from home to: 1) Residential green (150 m); Neighborhood green (400 m); Quarter green (800 m); District green (1600 m); City green (3200 m); Urban forest (5000 m) |
| Tsou, Hung et al. (2005) | Defined **varying distances** that depended on the type of facility:   * the service range of municipal facilities such as town parks, universities, museums and dump sites cover the **entire city**. * community facilities, including junior and senior high schools, transformer stations, etc., are typically in the **2 km** range. * The service range of neighborhood facilities like playgrounds and elementary schools is typically in **the 1 km** range. |
| Schlossberg, Agrawal et al. (2007) | walking distances to rail transit stations in Portland, WA, and San Francisco, were **a median distance** of **0.47 miles (756 m)** |
| Alshalalfah and Shalaby (2007) | showed that among transit users, 60 % live **within 300 m** from their stop and 80 % within **500 m** in Canada. |
| Larsen and Gilliland (2008) | Population within **500** m walk distance of supermarkets |
| Manaugh and El-Geneidy (2011) | used 400, 800 and 1200 m thresholds for calculating walkability score |
| Daniels and Mulley (2013) | the **mean walking distance** to bus service **461 m** with 75th percentile at **566 m**.  In the same study they found **mean walking** to rail around **805 m** and the 75th percentile at **1,018 m**.  Also, it is clear that these distances are significantly beyond the **400** m for buses and **800** for rail. |
| El-Geneidy, Grimsrud et al. (2014) | The 85th percentile walking distance to bus transit service is found to be around **524 m** for home-based trip origins, **1,259 m** for home-based commuter rail trip origins. |
| Azmi, Karim et al. (2013) | considered radius of **400 meter** (approximately 5 minute of walking) in the neighborhood area. |
| Saghapour (2017) | considered **20-30 mins** or **1.6 – 2.4 km** (Based on POI type) |
| van Soest, Tight et al. (2020) | **400 or 800** m thresholds for walking to public transport |
| Adhikari, Delgado-Ron et al. (2021) | **10–15 min of walking** time, a commonly used time frame to assess perceived proximity to amenities and services |
| **Cycling trips** | |
| Arasan, Rengaraju et al. (1996) | found an average critical trip time of **24 min** for bicycling. |
| Seneviratne (1985), Arasan, Rengaraju et al. (1994), Rastogi and Krishna Rao (2003) | proposed an average critical distance of **1100 m** across the categories of trip type, and **1050 m** and **750 m** respectively for the categories of male and female. |
| Houde, Apparicio et al. (2018) | access to the cycling network within a **500-metre** radius and the access to a cyclist-only bike path within a **500-metre** radius from the centroid of the census tract. |
| McNeil (2011) | the average cyclist would be willing to travel between **1 mi and 2.5 mi** for most utilitarian nonwork trips |
| Saghapour (2017) | Considered **10-20 mins or 2.5 - 4km** (Based on POI type) |
| Tucker and Manaugh (2017) | A cut-off length of **7 km** was used. |
| Manum, Nordstrom et al. (2019) | a travel-time threshold of **15 minutes** in one direction is a reasonable value for calculating the catchment area. (bicycling speeds vary) |
| Faghih Imani, Miller et al. (2019) | calculated the **30-minute** cycling thresholds to accessibility to jobs |
| Li, Huang et al. (2020) | consider the trips whose **trip distance** and **duration** are between the 1st (**301m and 180 s**) |
| Chen and Wang (2020) | five thresholds (**10-, 20-, 30-, 45-, and 60-minute**) by cycling. |
| Mora, Truffello et al. (2021) | Access to bicycle lanes from the blocks was modeled in consideration of three critical distances: **300 m, and 500 m or 1000 m** (Average minimum distance to bicycle lane) |

## Impedance functions

Impedance function is used to describe willingness of cyclists and pedestrian to travel to a destination as a function of cost (distance, time, etc.); it is a component of accessibility (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010, Yang and Diez-Roux 2012, Arranz-Lopez, Soria-Lara et al. 2019). The impedance function obtained by fitting to a real dataset provides a continuous description of cycling and walking probability at different costs. The spatial distribution of bicycle and pedestrian travel can be expressed using distance decay functions (Iacono, Krizek et al. 2010) as travel distance is a limiting factor for implementing use(Larsen and El-Geneidy 2011). Distance decay functions describe the effect of distance on spatial interactions and typically express distance as a function of travel impedance (time or cost). Rybarczyk and Wu (2010) identified the importance of the spatial patterns of bicycle facilities and connectivity of a local network when studying accessibility. Furthermore, increased connectivity within a network also allows for increased accessibility.

Some researchers have argued that – like maximum travel thresholds – distance-decay rates should differ according to trip purpose and different population groups (García-Palomares, Gutiérrez et al. 2013, Wu, Lu et al. 2019). Similarly, researchers also argue that walking and cycling impedance functions should be calculated separately due to their differing travel speeds and maximum travel ranges (Cheng, Caset et al. 2019). For example, the distance-decay curve for work trips shown in Figure 1 assumes that cyclists are half as likely to reach a work destination 20 minutes away than one 10 minutes away, and therefore, any jobs 20 minutes away would be applied half the weight of jobs 10 minutes away. These cycling weights differ slightly from walking trips since fewer people are willing to walk a longer distance to work. While adjusting the distance-decay functions by mode has the potential to improve accuracy, it can also be said that a consistent approach to measuring accessibility across modes is preferrable due to the possibility of causing one mode seem less accessible when applying different decay functions (State Smart Transportation Initiative, 2021).

In terms of the types of impedance functions considered, a negative exponential curve is common (Saghapour 2017, Wu, Lu et al. 2019) – example shown in Figure 1. However, some studies have also calculated study-specific distance-decay curves based on trip data rather than assuming a standard function. Wu, Lu et al. (2019) calculated a distance-decay function using data from Shenzhen’s dockless bicycle-sharing system. Their findings show that a lognormal distance decay best fit the distribution of bike-sharing trips, with the willingness to cycle increasing up to ~500m and decreasing thereafter. García-Palomares, Gutiérrez et al. (2013) took a similar approach for measuring walking accessibility to metro stations and found a linear distance-decay trend that varied significantly by age.
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Figure 1: Example travel time decay functions by mode for work vs. non-work trips. (Source: State Smart Transportation Initiative - based on data from 2017 National Household Travel Survey)

## Slope

One of the factors associated with the natural environment and has an effect on bicycle and walking trips is slope. hence, pedestrians and cyclists will travel out of their way to by-pass segments with steep slopes. because, For them, small positive increments in slope decrease travel speeds while increasing energy use and travel time. Besides, due to the differences in efforts to go up-slope versus down-slope, pedestrians and cyclists may not select the same way. This is referred to as anisotropic movement (Ebener, El Morjani et al. 2005).

There are few studies that have considered slope in measures of active accessibility, yet it is acknowledged as an important factor to include since people will often avoid routes with significant elevation gain, and routes with steep slopes may significantly impact accessibility. Often, network analyst tools use the shortest path from the road network, which may not reflect actual cycling or walking behaviour. Vale, Saraiva et al. (2015) concluded that slope should always be included in accessibility of bicycling and that it is also important for walking, however it is largely absent from walking accessibility measures. However, the greater availability of elevation data and advances in research in various disciplines offer opportunities to better understand the behavior of individuals when travelling in infrastructure-poor contexts and challenge assumptions surrounding the most important costs to be minimized. Papa, Carpentieri et al. (2018)also highlighted a significant difference in catchment areas when including versus excluding the slope attribute (~33% km2 difference for adults over 75). Wood, Jones et al. (2018) studied the sensitivity in distance calculation to variations in three travel-time modeling approaches, taking as reference a model that accounted for variations in land cover and directionality in slope (anisotropy). They found that an approach based on measuring Euclidean distances on a flat surface underestimated the distance traveled, relative to the reference. The second approach, which calculated the distances constrained to a road network, also varied substantially from the reference, underestimating it in some areas and overestimating in others. Finally, the third approach, which accounted for land cover and elevation but ignored the directionality of slopes slightly underestimated travel times.

Lundberg (2012) examined the local cycling and walking networks through Geographic Information Systems (GIS) using accessibility. They extracted a percent slope raster layer from DEM layer that was obtained from part of the National Elevation Dataset (NED). the percent slope of the DEM ranged from 0 to 360. In ArcMap, when the slope angle equals 45 degrees, the rise is equal to the run. Expressed as a percentage, the slope of this angle is 100%. As the slope angle approaches vertical (90o), the percentage slope approaches infinity. To calculate percent slope, this research used methods described by Price (2009). An X,Y coordinate was first calculated for the start point of each line segment. Next an X,Y coordinate was calculated for the end point of each line segment. ArcMap's 3D Analyst extension was used to convert the street network into a 3D layer, at which point percent slope could then be calculated as the Z-value for each of the line segments in the network. A Z-value (elevation) was calculated at the start points and end points of each line segment. The following equation was used to derive percent slope for each line segment:

slope values indicate uphill travel while negative slope values indicate downhill travel. In this regard, they proposed different walking and cycling speeds based on the different slopes using Parkin and Rotheram (2010) findings on the impact of slope on bicycle travel speeds. Fig.2 summarizes the various bicycle travel speeds used in the GIS modeling.
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Figure 2: Bicycle travel speeds used in GIS modeling

Pedestrian travel speeds were also calculated based on the effect of slope. Tobler’s hiking function was used to identify the effect of slope on travel speed. The following equation represents the modified Tobler's formula adjusted for percent slope:

Where v is velocity, e is the base for natural logarithms, and s is the slope in percent. Fig. 3 summarizes a pedestrian’s travel speed used in the modeling in GIS.
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Figure 3: Pedestrian travel speeds used in GIS modeling

In another study, Paez et al., (2020) calculated the slope from the vertical and horizontal displacements. The instantaneous slope (m) is given by the derivative of y = f(x) with respect to x. this is given by the following expression:

In a DEM layer, two physical aspects of the landscape that relate to resistance can be obtained directly from the grid, namely the vertical displacement and the horizontal displacement between nodes i and j. Δv and Δh are vertical and/or horizontal displacements respectively. This slope is linked to speed via Tobler's formula for hiking travel (Tobler 1993):

where the speed s is in m/min. The amount of speed can be converted into travel time in minutes if it is divided the distance by speed as follows:

where di can be the distance on the surface as discussed above or can be approximated by the horizontal distance Δh. As seen in Fig. 2, travel time tends to increase as the slope increases.
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Figure 4: Relationship between surface distance/travel time and slope

## Weather

Other factors that are associated with the natural environment and have also been shown to affect cycling and walking trips are as follows: weather, temperature, shade, and aesthetics. The type of weather an individual has to travel through has been identified as a principal factor in the decision process for employing non-motorized travel modes. The pinnacle conditions that individuals consider using non-motorized travel include dry weather and pleasant temperatures (60o to 75oF) (Zacharias 2001). High amounts of shade cover over a network and available aesthetics along a route increase the rates for non-motorized travel (Zahran, Brody et al. 2008).

## Level of Traffic Stress

Several of the cycling accessibility approaches incorporate bicycle infrastructure using level of traffic stress (LTS) (Faghih Imani, Miller et al. 2019, Murphy and Owen 2019). The LTS method was first proposed by Furth, Mekuria et al. (2016) to categorize street segments into 4 categories based on the number of lanes, presence of a parking lane, the speed limit, the bike lane and parking lane width, and any bike lane blockage. Murphy and Owen (2019) and Faghih Imani, Miller et al. (2019) compare cycling accessibility measures using different LTS categorizes to calculate service areas. Both studies exclude highways and high-volume roads from the network and classify into LTS categories using attribute information available from the network dataset (Faghih Imani, Miller et al. (2019) and Murphy and Owen (2019) used the City of Toronto open data and OSM data respectively).

The Canadian Bikeway Comfort and Safety (Can-BICS) Classification System aims to provide a common nomenclature for bicycle facilities based on user safety and comfort. The Can-BICS classification designates bicycling facilities into three categories: high, medium, and low comfort infrastructure. There is some general alignment between Can-BICS categories and LTS criteria, however, there are a few main differences:

Local street bikeways are classified as high comfort using Can-BICS, but either LTS 1 or 2 depending on the number of lanes.

Painted bike lanes may be assigned LTS 1 to 4 depending on the speed, width, and presence of parking lanes, whereas in Can-BICS, painted lanes are low comfort facilities.

Trails and walkways in parks are LTS 1 but may be categorized as non-conforming Can-BICS facilities depending on the trail surface (e.g., gravel or dirt vs. paved).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Facility Type | Can-BICS Class | LTS Category |
| Cycle tracks | High comfort | 1 |
| Local street bikeways | High comfort | 1 or 2 |
| Bike paths | High comfort | 1 |
| Multi-use paths | Medium comfort | 1 |
| Painted bike lanes | Low comfort | 1 to 4 |
| Park trails and walkways | Non-conforming | 1 |

## Origins/destinations & applying weights

Typically, the way in which opportunities are measured depends on the type of opportunity and whether one or multiple opportunity types are considered. For example, the studies measuring job accessibility or number of people served by transit consider a total count, whereas for urban park access, Reyes, Páez et al. (2014)and Cheng, Caset et al. (2019) consider cell counts to account for park area. Among walkability and bikeability indices it is also common to apply weights to the variables depending on the goals for analysis (Frank, Sallis et al. 2010, Vale, Saraiva et al. 2015, Arellana, Alvarez et al. 2021).

The majority of studies focus on origin-based accessibility (access to destinations), however, as argued by Vale, Saraiva et al. (2015), accessibility at destinations is also important. For example, individuals may reside in high accessible areas, but work in low-accessibility areas. In this respect, topology-based measures, may be preferred, or it may be useful to consider accessibility in terms of the population served around destinations of interest.

# Conclusion

Overall, there remains considerable variation in the types of accessibility measures applied in the context of walking and cycling. Among the four main types of active accessibility measures identified, the majority of recent studies use an activity-based approach, either measuring cumulative opportunities (within a catchment area / weighted by distance from the origin) or measuring gravity models. The activity-based approaches mainly vary in terms of the travel time and distance thresholds, and weighting impedance functions considered.

Many of the walking approaches, for instance, aim to incorporate a variable walking threshold (depending on age or location), while this is not seen within the context of cycling – where a prioritization of measures by route infrastructure is more apparent. Conversely, attention to infrastructure type, or comfort and safety, is not seen among pedestrian-focused studies.

When selecting an accessibility measure, there is evidently a trade-off between complexity and measure interpretability. While adding more complexity or multiple indices for different population groups, may increase accuracy, a simple, and easy to implement measure may be more important for widespread use.

Questions to address for future work include: (Jeneva’s thoughts in blue)

1. What type of measure is best suited for analysis across Canada given the available data and the project aims?
   * An-origin or destination-based measure? Or a topology-based measure?

An origin-destination based measure – cumulative opportunities

(Assuming it is preferable to have comparable metrics for cycling & walking)

1. If an origin/destination-based measure is selected:
   * What are destinations of interest? And how should they be measured? (E.g., number of opportunities, square footage)
   * Should opportunities be weighted?
2. How should travel be measured?
   * Travel distance or time? Euclidean or network distances?

Network distances would be preferrable although some researchers argue that results differ very little from Euclidean distances, and ease of implementation for a Canada-wide metric is an important consideration

Time might be better (could compare cycling vs. walking with same time threshold)

1. What geographic scale to consider?
   * Should accessibility measures be limited to CMAs?

Dissemination areas

1. Should analysis differ by population groups?
2. Should accessibility be measured within a catchment area? What would be the maximum distance/time-threshold for cycling vs. walking?

~15 minutes? Could compare varying thresholds

1. Should an impedance function be used? If so, what kind of function?

Distance-decay weighting seems preferrable

1. Can slope be incorporated?

Yes, see Paez et al. (2021) metabolic energy functions

# References

Achuthan, K., et al. (2007). Measuring pedestrian accessibility. Proceedings of the Geographical Information Science Research UK (GISRUK) Conference, National Centre for Geocomputation, National University of Ireland, Citeseer.

Adhikari, B., et al. (2021). "Community design and hypertension: Walkability and park access relationships with cardiovascular health." Int J Hyg Environ Health **237**: 113820.

BACKGROUND: There is an increased literature focusing on the role of the built and natural environments in preventing hypertension. However, very few studies have quantitively analyzed specific pathways through which urban form affects blood pressure levels. OBJECTIVES: To examine how features of the built and natural environments relate to hypertension and the mediating role of transportation and leisure walking and body mass index in this relationship. METHODS: We examined the association between neighbourhood walkability and park availability with hypertension through generalized linear models in two independent population cohorts. One Cohort was 22,418 adults (My Health My Community) and the other cohort was 11,972 adults (BC Generations Project). We employed a path analysis modelling approach to explore the presence and significance of mediating factors that may contribute to any association between walkability or park availability and hypertension. This study intentionally employed walkability measures enforced through municipal zoning and subdivision regulations legally underpinned by health, safety, and welfare. All models were adjusted for socioeconomic and other characteristics where data were available. RESULTS: Our analysis of two population-based Canadian cohorts consistently found that higher levels of walkability and park accessibility were both associated with significantly lower odds of self-reported hypertension, especially for lower income individuals. Mediation analysis showed that obesity accounted for 50% and 52.9% of the total effect of walkability and park accessibility on hypertension, respectively. DISCUSSION: We suggest an integrated population health approach that considers multimorbidity as a result of exposure to car-dependent areas and the lack of green spaces. Longitudinal research is needed to document causal effects of built and natural environments on hypertension.

Akgün, N., et al. (2018). "Cyclist casualty severity at roundabouts–To what extent do the geometric characteristics of roundabouts play a part?" Journal of safety research **67**: 83-91.

Alshalalfah, B. and A. Shalaby (2007). "Relationship of walk access distance to transit with service, travel, and personal characteristics." Journal of Urban Planning and Development **133**(2): 114-118.

Apparicio, P., et al. (2008). "Comparing alternative approaches to measuring the geographical accessibility of urban health services: Distance types and aggregation-error issues." Int J Health Geogr **7**: 7.

BACKGROUND: Over the past two decades, geographical accessibility of urban resources for population living in residential areas has received an increased focus in urban health studies. Operationalising and computing geographical accessibility measures depend on a set of four parameters, namely definition of residential areas, a method of aggregation, a measure of accessibility, and a type of distance. Yet, the choice of these parameters may potentially generate different results leading to significant measurement errors. The aim of this paper is to compare discrepancies in results for geographical accessibility of selected health care services for residential areas (i.e. census tracts) computed using different distance types and aggregation methods. RESULTS: First, the comparison of distance types demonstrates that Cartesian distances (Euclidean and Manhattan distances) are strongly correlated with more accurate network distances (shortest network and shortest network time distances) across the metropolitan area (Pearson correlation greater than 0.95). However, important local variations in correlation between Cartesian and network distances were observed notably in suburban areas where Cartesian distances were less precise.Second, the choice of the aggregation method is also important: in comparison to the most accurate aggregation method (population-weighted mean of the accessibility measure for census blocks within census tracts), accessibility measures computed from census tract centroids, though not inaccurate, yield important measurement errors for 5% to 10% of census tracts. CONCLUSION: Although errors associated to the choice of distance types and aggregation method are only important for about 10% of census tracts located mainly in suburban areas, we should not avoid using the best estimation method possible for evaluating geographical accessibility. This is especially so if these measures are to be included as a dimension of the built environment in studies investigating residential area effects on health. If these measures are not sufficiently precise, this could lead to errors or lack of precision in the estimation of residential area effects on health.

Arasan, V. T., et al. (1994). "Characteristics of trips by foot and bicycle modes in Indian city." Journal of Transportation Engineering **120**(2): 283-294.

Arasan, V. T., et al. (1996). "Trip characteristics of travelers without vehicles." Journal of Transportation Engineering **122**(1): 76-81.

Arellana, J., et al. (2021). "Walk this way: Pedestrian accessibility and equity in Barranquilla and Soledad, Colombia." Research in Transportation Economics **86**.

Arranz-Lopez, A., et al. (2019). "Measuring relative non-motorized accessibility to retail activities." International Journal of Sustainable Transportation **13**(9): 639-651.

Azmi, D. I., et al. (2013). "Comparative Study of Neighbourhood Walkability to Community Facilities between Two Precincts in Putrajaya." Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences **105**: 513-524.

Ben-Akiva, M. and S. R. Lerman (2021). Disaggregate travel and mobility-choice models and measures of accessibility. Behavioural travel modelling, Routledge**:** 654-679.

Bhopal, R. and N. Unwin (1995). Cycling, physical exercise, and the millennium fund, British Medical Journal Publishing Group. **311:** 344.

Blečić, I., et al. (2015). "Evaluating walkability: a capability-wise planning and design support system." International Journal of Geographical Information Science **29**(8): 1350-1374.

Boisjoly, G. and A. M. El-Geneidy (2017). "How to get there? A critical assessment of accessibility objectives and indicators in metropolitan transportation plans." Transport Policy **55**: 38-50.

Brezina, T., Ulrich Leth, and Helmut Lemmerer (2020). "Mental barriers in planning for cycling." The Politics of Cycling Infrastructure.

Brown, J. R., et al. (2009). "Planning for Cars in Cities: Planners, Engineers, and Freeways in the 20th Century." Journal of the American Planning Association **75**(2): 161-177.

Chen, N. and C.-H. Wang (2020). "Does green transportation promote accessibility for equity in medium-size U.S. cites?" Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **84**.

Cheng, L., et al. (2019). "Investigating walking accessibility to recreational amenities for elderly people in Nanjing, China." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **76**: 85-99.

Daniels, R. and C. Mulley (2013). "Explaining walking distance to public transport: The dominance of public transport supply." Journal of Transport and Land Use **6**(2): 5-20.

Devkota, B., et al. (2012). "Planning for non-motorized travel in rural Nepal: a role for geographic information systems." Journal of Transport Geography **24**: 282-291.

Dovey, K. and E. Pafka (2020). "What is walkability? The urban DMA." Urban Studies **57**(1): 93-108.

Duncan, D. T., et al. (2011). "Validation of Walk Score® for estimating neighborhood walkability: an analysis of four US metropolitan areas." International journal of environmental research and public health **8**(11): 4160-4179.

Ebener, S., et al. (2005). "Physical accessibility to health care: from isotropy to anisotropy." GIS@ development **9**(6).

El-Geneidy, A., et al. (2014). "New evidence on walking distances to transit stops: Identifying redundancies and gaps using variable service areas." Transportation **41**(1): 193-210.

El-Geneidy, A. and D. Levinson (2011). "Place rank: valuing spatial interactions." Networks and Spatial Economics **11**(4): 643-659.

Emery, J. and C. Crump (2011). "The WABSA project: assessing and improving your community’s walkability & bikeability. 2003." North Carolina Dep. Heal. Behav. Heal. Educ. Sch. Public Heal. Univ. North Carolina Chapel Hill.

Espada, I. and J. Luk (2011). Application of accessibility measures.

Faghih Imani, A., et al. (2019). "Cycle accessibility and level of traffic stress: A case study of Toronto." Journal of Transport Geography **80**.

Fishman, E. (2016). Cycling as transport, Taylor & Francis. **36:** 1-8.

Frank, L., et al. (2003). Health and community design: The impact of the built environment on physical activity, Island Press.

Frank, L. D., et al. (2004). "Obesity relationships with community design, physical activity, and time spent in cars." American journal of preventive medicine **27**(2): 87-96.

Frank, L. D., et al. (2017). "International comparison of observation-specific spatial buffers: maximizing the ability to estimate physical activity." International journal of health geographics **16**(1): 1-13.

Frank, L. D., et al. (2006). "Many pathways from land use to health: associations between neighborhood walkability and active transportation, body mass index, and air quality." Journal of the American Planning Association **72**(1): 75-87.

Frank, L. D., et al. (2010). "The development of a walkability index: application to the Neighborhood Quality of Life Study." Br J Sports Med **44**(13): 924-933.

Emerging evidence supports a link between neighbourhood built environment and physical activity. Systematic methodologies for characterising neighbourhood built environment are needed that take advantage of available population information such as census-level demographics. Based on transportation and urban planning literatures, an integrated index for operationalising walkability using parcel-level information is proposed. Validity of the walkability index is examined through travel surveys among areas examined in the Neighborhood Quality of Life Study (NQLS), a study investigating built environment correlates of adults' physical activity.

Frank, L. D., et al. (2005). "Linking objectively measured physical activity with objectively measured urban form: findings from SMARTRAQ." American journal of preventive medicine **28**(2): 117-125.

Furth, P. G., et al. (2016). "Network connectivity for low-stress bicycling." Transportation research record **2587**(1): 41-49.

García-Palomares, J. C., et al. (2013). "Walking accessibility to public transport: an analysis based on microdata and GIS." Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design **40**(6): 1087-1102.

Geurs, K. T. and J. R. Ritsema van Eck (2001). "Accessibility measures: review and applications. Evaluation of accessibility impacts of land-use transportation scenarios, and related social and economic impact." RIVM rapport 408505006.

Geurs, K. T. and B. Van Wee (2004). "Accessibility evaluation of land-use and transport strategies: review and research directions." Journal of Transport Geography **12**(2): 127-140.

Grasser, G., et al. (2013). "Objectively measured walkability and active transport and weight-related outcomes in adults: a systematic review." Int J Public Health **58**(4): 615-625.

OBJECTIVES: The aim of this study was to investigate which GIS-based measures of walkability (density, land-use mix, connectivity and walkability indexes) in urban and suburban neighbourhoods are used in research and which of them are consistently associated with walking and cycling for transport, overall active transportation and weight-related measures in adults. METHODS: A systematic review of English publications using PubMed, Science Direct, Active Living Research Literature Database, the Transportation Research Information Service and reference lists was conducted. The search terms utilised were synonyms for GIS in combination with synonyms for the outcomes. RESULTS: Thirty-four publications based on 19 different studies were eligible. Walkability measures such as gross population density, intersection density and walkability indexes most consistently correlated with measures of physical activity for transport. Results on weight-related measures were inconsistent. CONCLUSIONS: More research is needed to determine whether walkability is an appropriate measure for predicting weight-related measures and overall active transportation. As most of the consistent correlates, gross population density, intersection density and the walkability indexes have the potential to be used in planning and monitoring.

Grasser, G., et al. (2017). "A European perspective on GIS-based walkability and active modes of transport." Eur J Public Health **27**(1): 145-151.

BACKGROUND: The association between GIS-based walkability and walking for transport is considered to be well established in USA and in Australia. Research on the association between walkability and cycling for transport in European cities is lacking. The aim of this study was to test the predictive validity of established walkability measures and to explore alternative walkability measures associated with walking and cycling for transport in a European context. METHODS: Outcome data were derived from the representative cross-sectional survey ( n &thinsp;&equals;&thinsp;843) &lsquo;Radfreundliche Stadt&rsquo; of adults in the city of Graz (Austria). GIS-based walkability was measured using both established measures (e.g. gross population density, household unit density, entropy index, three-way intersection density, IPEN walkability index) and alternative measures (e.g. proportion of mixed land use, four-way intersection density, Graz walkability index). ANCOVAs were conducted to examine the adjusted association between walkability measures and outcomes. RESULTS: Household unit density, proportion of mixed land use, three-way intersection density and IPEN walkability index were positively associated with walking for transport, but the other measures were not. All walkability measures were positively associated with cycling for transport. CONCLUSION: The established walkability measures were applicable to a European city such as Graz. The alternative walkability measures performed well in a European context. Due to measurement issues the association between these walkability measures and walking for transport needs to be investigated further.

Greenberg, M. R. and J. Renne (2005). "Where does walkability matter the most? An environmental justice interpretation of New Jersey data." Journal of urban health **82**(1): 90-100.

Gutiérrez, J. and J. C. García-Palomares (2008). "Distance-measure impacts on the calculation of transport service areas using GIS." Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design **35**(3): 480-503.

Hakim, A. A., et al. (1998). "Effects of walking on mortality among nonsmoking retired men." New England Journal of Medicine **338**(2): 94-99.

Halden, D., et al. (2000). Accessibility: Review of measuring techniques and their application, Great Britain, Scottish Executive, Central Research Unit Edinburgh, UK.

Handy, S. (2020). "Is accessibility an idea whose time has finally come?" Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **83**.

Handy, S. L., & Niemeier, D. A (1997). "Measuring accessibility: an exploration of issues and alternatives." Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space.

Handy, S. L. and D. A. Niemeier (1997). "Measuring accessibility: an exploration of issues and alternatives." Environment and planning A **29**(7): 1175-1194.

Hansen, W. G. (1959). "How accessibility shapes land use." Journal of the American Institute of planners **25**(2): 73-76.

Harkey, D. L., et al. (1998). "Development of the bicycle compatibility index." Transportation research record **1636**(1): 13-20.

Harkey, D. L., et al. (1998). Development of the bicycle compatibility index: A level of service concept, final report, United States. Federal Highway Administration.

Harris, B. (2001). "Accessibility: concepts and applications." Journal of transportation and statistics **4**(2/3): 15-30.

Hochmair, H. H. (2015). "Assessment of bicycle service areas around transit stations." International Journal of Sustainable Transportation **9**(1): 15-29.

Hoedl, S., et al. (2010). "The bikeability and walkability evaluation table: Reliability and application." American journal of preventive medicine **39**(5): 457-459.

Horacek, T. M., et al. (2012). "Sneakers and spokes: An assessment of the walkability and bikeability of US postsecondary institutions." Journal of Environmental Health **74**(7): 8-15.

Horner, M. W. (2004). "Exploring metropolitan accessibility and urban structure." Urban Geography **25**(3): 264-284.

Houde, M., et al. (2018). "A ride for whom: Has cycling network expansion reduced inequities in accessibility in Montreal, Canada?" Journal of Transport Geography **68**: 9-21.

Hsiao, S., et al. (1997). "Use of geographic information system for analysis of transit pedestrian access." Transportation research record **1604**(1): 50-59.

Hsu, C.-I. and Y.-C. Tsai (2014). "An Energy Expenditure Approach for Estimating Walking Distance." Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design **41**(2): 289-306.

Hull, A., et al. (2012). Accessibility instruments for planning practice, Cost Office Brussels.

Hunt, J. D. and J. E. Abraham (2006). "Influences on bicycle use." Transportation **34**(4): 453-470.

Iacono, M., et al. (2010). "Measuring non-motorized accessibility: issues, alternatives, and execution." Journal of Transport Geography **18**(1): 133-140.

Iseki, H. and M. Tingstrom (2014). "A new approach for bikeshed analysis with consideration of topography, street connectivity, and energy consumption." Computers, Environment and Urban Systems **48**: 166-177.

Jabbari, M., et al. (2021). "Accessibility and Connectivity Criteria for Assessing Walkability: An Application in Qazvin, Iran." Sustainability **13**(7).

Kimpel, T. J., et al. (2007). "Using GIS to measure the effect of overlapping service areas on passenger boardings at bus stops."

Koglin, T. (2020). Spatial dimensions of the marginalisation of cycling–marginalization through rationalisation? The Politics of Cycling Infrastructure, Policy Press**:** 55-72.

Koszowski, C., et al. (2019). Active mobility: bringing together transport planning, urban planning, and public health. Towards User-Centric Transport in Europe, Springer**:** 149-171.

Krizek, K. J., Michael Iacono, Ahmed M. El-Geneidy, Chen-Fu Liao, and Robert Johns (2009). "Access to destinations: Application of accessibility measures for non-auto travel modes." Minnesota. Dept. of Transportation. Research Services Section.

Kwan (1998). "Space‐time and integral measures of individual accessibility: a comparative analysis using a point‐based framework." Geographical analysis.

Lam, W. and J. Morrall (1982). "Bus passenger walking distances and waiting times: a summer-winter comparison." Transportation Quarterly **36**(HS-033 385).

Landis, B. W., et al. (1997). "Real-time human perceptions: toward a bicycle level of service." Transportation research record **1578**(1): 119-126.

Landis, B. W., et al. (2003). "Intersection level of service for the bicycle through movement." Transportation research record **1828**(1): 101-106.

Larsen, J. and A. El-Geneidy (2011). "A travel behavior analysis of urban cycling facilities in Montréal, Canada." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **16**(2): 172-177.

Larsen, K. and J. Gilliland (2008). "Mapping the evolution of'food deserts' in a Canadian city: Supermarket accessibility in London, Ontario, 1961–2005." International journal of health geographics **7**(1): 1-16.

Lavery, T. A., et al. (2013). "Driving out of choices: An investigation of transport modality in a university sample." Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice **57**: 37-46.

Leslie, E., et al. (2007). "Walkability of local communities: using geographic information systems to objectively assess relevant environmental attributes." Health & place **13**(1): 111-122.

Leveille, S. G., et al. (1999). "Aging successfully until death in old age: opportunities for increasing active life expectancy." American Journal of Epidemiology **149**(7): 654-664.

Levine, J. (2010). Zoned out: Regulation, markets, and choices in transportation and metropolitan land use, RFF Press.

Li, A., et al. (2020). "An approach to imputing destination activities for inclusion in measures of bicycle accessibility." Journal of Transport Geography **82**.

Liao, B., et al. (2020). "Empirical analysis of walkability using data from the Netherlands." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **85**.

Lowry, M. B., et al. (2012). "Assessment of Communitywide Bikeability with Bicycle Level of Service." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board **2314**(1): 41-48.

Lundberg, B. (2012). "Accessibility and university populations: Local effects on non-motorized transportation in the Tuscaloosa-Northport area."

Madsen, T., et al. (2014). "Developing suitable buffers to capture transport cycling behavior." Frontiers in Public Health **2**: 61.

Manaugh, K. and A. El-Geneidy (2011). "Validating walkability indices: How do different households respond to the walkability of their neighborhood?" Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **16**(4): 309-315.

Manum, B., et al. (2019). Using realistic travel-time thresholds in accessibility measures of bicycle route networks. Proceedings of the 12th space syntax symposium.

McNeil, N. (2011). "Bikeability and the 20-min Neighborhood." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board **2247**(1): 53-63.

Mekuria, M. C., Peter G. Furth, and Hilary Nixon. (2012). "Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity."

Mella Lira, B. and A. Paez (2021). "Do drivers dream of walking? An investigation of travel mode dissonance from the perspective of affective values." Journal of Transport & Health **20**.

Milakis, D., et al. (2015). "Do people consider an acceptable travel time? Evidence from Berkeley, CA." Journal of Transport Geography **44**: 76-86.

Millera, H. J. (2011). "Collaborative mobility: using geographic information science to cultivate cooperative transportation systems." Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences **21**: 24-28.

Millward, H., et al. (2013). "Active-transport walking behavior: destinations, durations, distances." Journal of Transport Geography **28**: 101-110.

Mora, R., et al. (2021). "Equity and accessibility of cycling infrastructure: An analysis of Santiago de Chile." Journal of Transport Geography **91**.

Murphy, B. and A. Owen (2019). "Implementing Low-Stress Bicycle Routing in National Accessibility Evaluation." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board **2673**(5): 240-249.

Murray, A. T. and X. Wu (2003). "Accessibility tradeoffs in public transit planning." Journal of Geographical Systems **5**(1): 93-107.

Neilson, G. K. and W. K. Fowler (1972). "Relation between transit ridership and walking distances in a low-density Florida retirement area." Highway Research Record(403).

Ng, A., et al. (2017). "Cyclist’safety perceptions of cycling infrastructure at un-signalised intersections: Cross-sectional survey of Queensland cyclists." Journal of Transport & Health **6**: 13-22.

Nicholls, S. (2001). "Measuring the accessibility and equity of public parks: A case study using GIS." Managing leisure **6**(4): 201-219.

Nielsen, T. A. S. and H. Skov-Petersen (2018). "Bikeability – Urban structures supporting cycling. Effects of local, urban and regional scale urban form factors on cycling from home and workplace locations in Denmark." Journal of Transport Geography **69**: 36-44.

O'Neill, W. A., et al. (1992). "Analysis of transit service areas using geographic information systems." Transportation research record **364**: 131.

O'Sullivan, S. and J. Morrall (1996). "Walking distances to and from light-rail transit stations." Transportation research record **1538**(1): 19-26.

Oehl, M., et al. (2019). "Cyclists’ anger experiences in traffic: the cycling anger scale." Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour **62**: 564-574.

Ortega, E., et al. (2021). "Evaluating the impact of urban design scenarios on walking accessibility: the case of the Madrid ‘Centro’district." Sustainable Cities and Society **74**: 103156.

Otero, I., et al. (2018). "Health impacts of bike sharing systems in Europe." Environment international **115**: 387-394.

Páez, A., et al. (2020). "Comparing distance, time, and metabolic energy cost functions for walking accessibility in infrastructure-poor regions." Journal of Transport Geography **82**.

Páez, A., et al. (2010). "Relative Accessibility Deprivation Indicators for Urban Settings: Definitions and Application to Food Deserts in Montreal." Urban Studies **47**(7): 1415-1438.

Páez, A., et al. (2012). "Measuring accessibility: positive and normative implementations of various accessibility indicators." Journal of Transport Geography **25**: 141-153.

Papa, E., et al. (2018). "Measuring walking accessibility to public transport for the elderly: the case of Naples." TeMA-Journal of Land Use, Mobility and Environment: 105-116.

Parkin, J. and J. Rotheram (2010). "Design speeds and acceleration characteristics of bicycle traffic for use in planning, design and appraisal." Transport Policy **17**(5): 335-341.

Pearce, J., Karen Witten, and Phil Bartie (2006). "Neighbourhoods and health: a GIS approach to measuring community resource accessibility." Epidemiology & Community Health.

Pérez, B. O., et al. (2017). "Mind the Gap: Assessing the Impacts of Bicycle Accessibility and Mobility on Mode Share in Washington, D.C." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board **2662**(1): 83-92.

Pokorny, P., et al. (2018). "Conflicts between bikes and trucks in urban areas—A survey of Norwegian cyclists." Case Studies on Transport Policy **6**(1): 147-155.

Prins, R. G., et al. (2014). "How many walking and cycling trips made by elderly are beyond commonly used buffer sizes: results from a GPS study." Health Place **27**: 127-133.

In choosing appropriate buffer sizes to study environmental influences on physical activity, studies are hampered by insufficient insight into the distance elderly travel actively. This study aims at getting insight into the number of trips walked and cycled within various buffer sizes using GPS measures. Data were obtained from the Elderly And their Neighborhood study (Spijkenisse, the Netherlands (2011-2012)). Trip length and mode of transport were derived from the GPS data (N=120; total number of trips=337). Distance decay functions were fitted to estimate the percentage of trips to grocery stores within commonly used buffer sizes. Fifty percent of the trips walked had a distance of at least 729m; for trips cycled this was 1665m. Elderly aged under 75 years and those with functional limitations walked and cycled shorter distances than those over 75 years and those without functional limitations. Males cycled shorter distances than females. Distance decay functions may aid the selection of appropriate buffer sizes, which may be tailored to individual characteristics.

Proffitt, D. G., et al. (2019). "Accessibility planning in American metropolitan areas: Are we there yet?" Urban Studies **56**(1): 167-192.

Pucher, J., et al. (2010). "Infrastructure, programs, and policies to increase bicycling: an international review." Preventive medicine **50**: S106-S125.

Pucher, J. B., Ralph; R. Bassett,David; L. Dannenberg, Andrew (2010). "Walking and Cycling to Health: A Comparative Analysis of City, State, and International Data." DF-1.4 %âãÏÓ 59 50 obj <</Linearized 51/L 569676/O 569661/E 441569/N 569677/T 568449/H [ 561156 569515]>> endobj xref 569659 569643 0000000016 0000000000 n 0000001671 0000000000 n 0000001751 0000000000 n 0000001959 0000000000 n 0000002170 0000000000 n 0000002549 0000000000 n 0000002950 0000000000 n 0000003513 0000000000 n 0000003547 0000000000 n 0000003608 0000000000 n 0000003896 0000000000 n 0000004224 0000000000 n 0000004773 0000000000 n 0000004849 0000000000 n 0000006409 0000000000 n 0000006923 0000000000 n 0000007093 0000000000 n 0000007519 0000000000 n 0000008964 0000000000 n 0000010431 0000000000 n 0000011948 0000000000 n 0000013378 0000000000 n 0000013676 0000000000 n 0000014023 0000000000 n 0000014647 0000000000 n 0000014901 0000000000 n 0000016408 0000000000 n 0000016727 0000000000 n 0000016965 0000000000 n 0000018428 0000000000 n 0000019759 0000000000 n 0000409614 0000000000 n 0000410562 0000000000 n 0000412437 0000000000 n 0000415381 0000000000 n 0000424887 0000000000 n 0000433532 0000000000 n 0000435005 0000000000 n 0000435993 0000000000 n 0000437870 0000000000 n 0000438134 0000000000 n 0000441175 0000000000 n 0000001156 0000000000 n trailer <</Size 0000000102/Prev 0000568438/Root 0000000060 0000000010 R/Info 0000000058 0000000010 R/ID[<0000645857DD0000000012FC0000000086F0000000023FDB0000000079F0000000019BE0000915232><0000000041AA0000000878E0000004214AAAD0000004801F0000000017C0000008439C0000000015>]>> startxref 0000000010 %%EOF 0000000101 0000000010 obj<</Length 0000000421/Filter/FlateDecode/I 0000000528/L 0000000512/S 0000000301/T 0000000461>>stream xÚb```f``000000001¹ÂÀÆÀ ô˜A˜ „ X¢, S š .¥<àü¡·000000001²õÉ  –W L ×ÌßÄ `À Œž {-ŽN–QbNm—­ü¡ØeèiâÔ¶j·þnÅC f …×ç0000000017Y rÑ¸Ü#ujýzívŽ†›‰Çãê0000000018’·ó¸ª\ä0000000013X0000000018Í§ ƒwšLéó m G%&rÉ(û ûœ€Š.

Rastogi, R. and K. Krishna Rao (2003). "Travel characteristics of commuters accessing transit: Case study." Journal of Transportation Engineering **129**(6): 684-694.

Reyes, M., et al. (2014). "Walking accessibility to urban parks by children: A case study of Montreal." Landscape and Urban Planning **125**: 38-47.

Rojas-Rueda, D., et al. (2011). "The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: health impact assessment study." Bmj **343**.

Rojas-Rueda, D., et al. (2012). "Replacing car trips by increasing bike and public transport in the greater Barcelona metropolitan area: a health impact assessment study." Environment international **49**: 100-109.

Rosas-Satizabal, D., et al. (2020). "Cycling diversity, accessibility, and equality: An analysis of cycling commuting in Bogota." TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PART D-TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT **88**.

Ruffino, P. and M. Jarre (2021). Appraisal of cycling and pedestrian projects. New Methods, Reflections and Application Domains in Transport Appraisal**:** 165-203.

Ruiz-Padillo, A., et al. (2018). "Application of multi-criteria decision analysis methods for assessing walkability: A case study in Porto Alegre, Brazil." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **63**: 855-871.

Rybarczyk, G. and L. Gallagher (2014). "Measuring the potential for bicycling and walking at a metropolitan commuter university." Journal of Transport Geography **39**: 1-10.

Rybarczyk, G. and C. Wu (2010). "Bicycle facility planning using GIS and multi-criteria decision analysis." Applied Geography **30**(2): 282-293.

Sadler, R. C., et al. (2011). "An application of the edge effect in measuring accessibility to multiple food retailer types in Southwestern Ontario, Canada." International journal of health geographics **10**(1): 1-15.

Saelens, B. E. and S. L. Handy (2008). "Built environment correlates of walking: a review." Medicine and science in sports and exercise **40**(7 Suppl): S550.

Saghapour, T., Sara Moridpour, and Russell G (2017). "Measuring cycling accessibility in metropolitan areas." International Journal of Sustainable Transportation.

Schlossberg, M., et al. (2007). "How far, by which route, and why? A spatial analysis of pedestrian preference."

Schoner, J. E. and D. M. Levinson (2014). "The missing link: Bicycle infrastructure networks and ridership in 74 US cities." Transportation **41**(6): 1187-1204.

Seneviratne, P. N. (1985). "Acceptable walking distances in central areas." Journal of Transportation Engineering **111**(4): 365-376.

Sisson, S. B., Sarah M. Lee, Elizabeth K. Burns, and Catrine Tudor-Locke (2006). "Suitability of commuting by bicycle to Arizona elementary schools." American Journal of Health Promotion.

Smoyer‐Tomic, K. E., et al. (2004). "Spatial accessibility and equity of playgrounds in Edmonton, Canada." Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien **48**(3): 287-302.

StatisticsCanada (2021). "Census of population ".

Strawbridge, W. J., et al. (1996). "Successful aging: predictors and associated activities." American Journal of Epidemiology **144**(2): 135-141.

Taylor, B. D. (2006). "Putting a Price on Mobility: Cars and Contradictions in Planning." Journal of the American Planning Association **72**(3): 279-284.

Tilahun, N. Y., et al. (2007). "Trails, lanes, or traffic: Valuing bicycle facilities with an adaptive stated preference survey." Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice **41**(4): 287-301.

Tinessa, F., et al. (2021). "Walkability, accessibility to metro stations and retail location choice: Some evidence from the case study of Naples." Research in Transportation Business & Management **40**.

Tobler, W. (1993). Three presentations on geographical analysis and modeling, Citeseer.

Train, K. E. (2009). "Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation Second Edition Introduction." Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation, 2nd Edition: 1-+.

Tsou, K.-W., et al. (2005). "An accessibility-based integrated measure of relative spatial equity in urban public facilities." Cities **22**(6): 424-435.

Tucker, B. and K. Manaugh (2017). "Bicycle equity in Brazil: Access to safe cycling routes across neighborhoods in Rio de Janeiro and Curitiba." International Journal of Sustainable Transportation **12**(1): 29-38.

Ulmer, J. M., and Lester A. Hoel (2003). "Evaluating the Accessibility of Residential Areas for Bicycling and Walking using GIS."

Unit, S. E. (2003). "Making the connections: final report on transportation and social exclusion." Social Exclusion Unit. Retrieved September **20**: 2015.

Useche, S. A., et al. (2019). "Healthy but risky: A descriptive study on cyclists’ encouraging and discouraging factors for using bicycles, habits and safety outcomes." Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour **62**: 587-598.

Vale, D. d. S. (2009). Sustainable Urban Form, Accessibility and Travel: The relationship between polycentric urban development and commuting in Lisbon, Newcastle University.

Vale, D. S. and M. Pereira (2017). "The influence of the impedance function on gravity-based pedestrian accessibility measures: A comparative analysis." Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science **44**(4): 740-763.

Vale, D. S., et al. (2015). "Active accessibility: A review of operational measures of walking and cycling accessibility." Journal of Transport and Land Use.

Van Herzele, A. and T. Wiedemann (2003). "A monitoring tool for the provision of accessible and attractive urban green spaces." Landscape and Urban Planning **63**(2): 109-126.

van Soest, D., et al. (2020). "Exploring the distances people walk to access public transport." Transport Reviews **40**(2): 160-182.

Vasconcelos, A. S. and T. L. Farias (2012). "Evaluation of urban accessibility indicators based on internal and external environmental costs." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **17**(6): 433-441.

Wahlgren, L. and P. Schantz (2012). "Exploring bikeability in a metropolitan setting: stimulating and hindering factors in commuting route environments." BMC public health **12**(1): 1-16.

WalkScore (2020). "<https://www.walkscore.com/>."

Weiss, R. L., et al. (2010). "Promoting active urban aging: A measurement approach to neighborhood walkability for older adults." Cities and the Environment **3**(1): 12.

Weuve, J., et al. (2004). "Physical activity, including walking, and cognitive function in older women." Jama **292**(12): 1454-1461.

Wiersma, J. K. (2020). "Commuting patterns and car dependency in urban regions." Journal of Transport Geography **84**.

Winters, M., et al. (2013). "Mapping bikeability: a spatial tool to support sustainable travel." Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design **40**(5): 865-883.

Wood, N., et al. (2018). "Pedestrian evacuation modeling to reduce vehicle use for distant tsunami evacuations in Hawaiʻi." International journal of disaster risk reduction **28**: 271-283.

Wu, X., et al. (2019). "Measuring the Destination Accessibility of Cycling Transfer Trips in Metro Station Areas: A Big Data Approach." Int J Environ Res Public Health **16**(15).

Cycling is a green, sustainable, and healthy choice for transportation that has been widely advocated worldwide in recent years. It can also encourage the use of public transit by solving the "last-mile" issue, because transit passengers can cycle to and from transit stations to achieve a combination of speed and flexibility. Cycling as a transfer mode has been shown to be affected by various built environment characteristics, such as the urban density, land-use mix, and destination accessibility, that is, the ease with which cyclists can reach their destinations. However, cycling destination accessibility is loosely defined in the literature and the methods of assessing cycling accessibility is often assumed to be equivalent to walking accessibility using the same decay curves, such as the negative exponential function, which ignores the competitive relationship between cycling and walking within a short distance range around transit stations. In this study, we aim to fill the above gap by measuring the cycling destination accessibility of metro station areas using data from more than three million bicycle-metro transfer trips from a dockless bicycle-sharing program in Shenzhen, China. We found that the frequency of bicycle-metro trips has a positive association with a trip distance of 500 m or less and a negative association with a trip distance beyond 500 m. A new cycling accessibility metric with a lognormal distribution decay curve was developed by considering the distance decay characteristics and cycling's competition with walking. The new accessibility model outperformed the traditional model with an exponential decay function, or that without a distance decay function, in predicting the frequency of bicycle-metro trips. Hence, to promote bicycle-metro integration, urban planners and government agencies should carefully consider the destination accessibility of metro station areas.

Yang, Y. and A. V. Diez-Roux (2012). "Walking distance by trip purpose and population subgroups." Am J Prev Med **43**(1): 11-19.

BACKGROUND: Walking distance is an important concept in the fields of transportation and public health. A distance of 0.25 miles is often used as an acceptable walking distance in U.S. research studies. Overall, research on the distance and duration of walking trips for different purposes and across different population groups remains limited. PURPOSE: This study examines the prevalence of walking and distances and durations of walking trips for different purposes among U.S. residents. METHODS: The distances and durations of walking trips for different purposes across population groups were compared using nationally representative data from the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS). Distance decay functions were used to summarize the distribution of walking distances and durations for different purposes and population subgroups. Data were analyzed in 2011. RESULTS: Sixteen percent of respondents had at least one daily walking trip. The mean and median values for walking distance were 0.7 and 0.5 miles, respectively. For walking duration, the mean and median values were 14.9 and 10 minutes. About 65% of walking trips were more than 0.25 miles in distance, and about 18% of walking trips were more than 1 mile. Large variations were found among various purposes for both distance and duration. The distances and durations of walking for recreation were substantially longer than those for other purposes. People with lower versus higher household income walked longer distances for work but shorter distances for recreation. CONCLUSIONS: Only a small fraction of respondents walk, but trips longer than 0.25 miles are common. There is substantial variability in the distance and duration of walking trips by purpose and population subgroups. These differences have implications for developing strategies to increase physical activity through walking.

Zacharias, J. (2001). "Pedestrian behavior pedestrian behavior and perception in urban walking environments." Journal of planning literature **16**(1): 3-18.

Zahran, S., et al. (2008). "Cycling and walking: Explaining the spatial distribution of healthy modes of transportation in the United States." Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment **13**(7): 462-470.

Zhao, F., et al. (2003). "Forecasting transit walk accessibility: Regression model alternative to buffer method." Transportation research record **1835**(1): 34-41.

Zielstra, D. and H. H. Hochmair (2011). "Comparative study of pedestrian accessibility to transit stations using free and proprietary network data." Transportation research record **2217**(1): 145-152.

1. Walkscore.com. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. most studies (conducted mainly in USA and Australia) use 1000 m buffers. The European environmental questionnaire ALPHA used a distance of 10- to 15-min walk (i.e. \_1–1.6 km) as a neighborhood scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)