

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

PSU Transportation Seminars

Transportation Research and Education Center  
(TREC)

---

1-10-2014

# Bicycling Is Different: Built Environment Relationships to Nonwork Travel

Christopher D. Muhs

*Portland State University*, [cdmuhs@gmail.com](mailto:cdmuhs@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/trec\\_seminar](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/trec_seminar)



Part of the [Transportation Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

## Recommended Citation

Muhs, Christopher D., "Bicycling Is Different: Built Environment Relationships to Nonwork Travel" (2014). *PSU Transportation Seminars*. 77.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/trec\\_seminar/77](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/trec_seminar/77)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in PSU Transportation Seminars by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

# Bicycling is Different

## Built Environment Relationships to Non-work Travel



Source: Muhs, 2013

Christopher D. Muhs  
Kelly J. Clifton

[muhs@pdx.edu](mailto:muhs@pdx.edu)  
[kclifton@pdx.edu](mailto:kclifton@pdx.edu)

# Introduction



+



=

Non-motorized  
travel

# Introduction



+



=



Non-motorized  
travel

# Introduction



Source: CC, Harvey Barrison, Flickr



Source: CC, DDOTDC, Flickr

# Background

Key findings from separated walk/bike analyses in non-work mode choice literature:

1. Trip distance matters more for walking than for biking
2. Mixed results in environmental variables that have significant relationships between the two modes
3. Socio-demographic variables often have most explanatory power



# Purpose

Add to knowledge of segmented active travel mode analysis

# Contributions

1. Destination-based dataset
2. Control for three shopping destination types
3. Mode choice and mode share analysis

# Survey Establishments



0 2.5 5 Miles

**Legend**

**Land Use Types**

- Convenience Store
- ▲ Drinking Establishment
- Restuarant

— Major Facilities

■ Rivers



# Data - Individuals

- Monday–Thursday, 5-7 pm, May–Oct. 2011
- No data collected during rainy weather
- Survey of:
  - Travel mode(s)
  - Socio-demographics
  - Attitudes towards travel @ establishment
  - Locations: home, work, previous, next
- Asked refusals for mode & home location



# Methods

1. Address built environment multicollinearity
2. Binary logit models of mode choice
3. Tobit regression models of mode share

# Methods – Data Reduction

- Gathered from site visits, RLIS, & US Census Bureau
- Summarized for ½ mile around each establishment
- BE variables all highly correlated ( $R > 0.30$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )
- Factor analysis used to reduce data to one measure

Built Environment Variable	Factor loading
Activity density	0.906
Intersection density	0.835
Lot coverage	0.944
Percent single-family housing	-0.782
Distance to light rail station	-0.578
Percent of variance explained	67.1%

# Built Environment Factor = -1



Source: Muhs, 2013

# Built Environment Factor = 0



Source: Muhs, 2013

# Built Environment Factor = 1



# Key Results – Mode Choice of Individuals

Variables		Walk	Bike	Automobile
Trip	Distance	--		+

Variables		Walk	Bike	Automobile
Built environment	BE Factor	+		-
	Low-stress bikeways			+
	On arterial	-		+
	Shopping center			+



= Positive significant result



= Negative significant result

# Key Results – Mode Share at Establishments

Variables		Walk	Bike	Automobile
Trip averages	Avg. distance	–		+

Variables		Walk	Bike	Automobile
Built environment	BE Factor	++		--
	Low-stress bikeways	+		–
	On arterial			
	Shopping center			+
	Bike corral		+	
	Bike parking		+	





# Findings Summary

- Walking & vehicle modes: similar built env. relationships, in opposite directions
- Bicycling influenced by a different set of characteristics
- Results of analyses at different levels vary

# Implications

- Move away from combining active modes into *non-motorized* category
- More empirical work needed to define a “bicycle supportive environment”
  - Models confirm ideas on distances
  - Test in other cities
  - Test at other land use types
  - Study other attributes: traffic separation, intersection controls, built env. at origin & route, pedestrian & vehicle volumes

# Thank you!



Paper # 14-4778 Christ

[muhs@pdx.edu](mailto:muhs@pdx.edu)



Source: Muhs, 2013

# Results – Mode Choice of Individuals

	Variables	Walk	Bike	Automobile
Establishment type	Convenience store	+		-
	Bar	+	+	-
Demographics	Income		-	
	Gender = M		+	
	Age > 35		-	+
	Vehicle in HH	-		++
	Child in HH	+		-
Trip	Work-based	-	+	
	Group size	-		+
	Distance	---		+
Attitudes/ perceptions	Positive towards car parking		-	+
	Positive towards mode	+	+	
Built environment	BE Factor	+		-
	Low-stress bikeways			+

# Results – Mode Share at Establishments

Variables		Walk	Bike	Automobile
Establishment type	Convenience store	+		
	Bar		+	-
Demographic averages	Avg. % Male	-		
	% with Child in HH			-
Trip averages	% Work-based			-
	Avg. group size			
	Avg. distance	-		+
Built environment	BE Factor	++		--
	Low-stress bikeways	+		-
	On arterial			
	Shopping center			+
	Bike corral		+	
	Bike parking		+	

# Limitations

- Limited number of customers used to aggregate to establishments
- Good weather during data collection may bias observations towards optimistic travel behavior
- Local establishments → customer bias?
- Uncertainty of results in a different setting