Understanding the Demographic Differences in Neighborhood Walking Supports

Susan A. Carlson,

Kathleen B. Watson,

Prabasaj Paul,

Thomas L. Schmid,

Janet E. Fulton

Physical Activity and Health Branch, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA.

Abstract

Background: Information about how presence and usefulness of neighborhood supports for walking differs by demographic characteristics can help guide community strategies to promote walking.

Methods: Reported presence and usefulness of neighborhood supports (shops, transit stops, sidewalks, parks, interesting things to look at, well-lit at night, low crime rate, and cars following speed limit) were examined in 3973 U.S. adults who completed the 2014 SummerStyles survey.

Results: Percentage reporting neighborhood supports as present ranged from 25.3% (SE = 0.8) for interesting things to 55.8% (SE = 1.0) for low crime rate. Percentage who reported a support as useful ranged from 24.6% (SE = 1.4) for transit stops to 79.0% (SE = 1.1) for sidewalks among those with the support. This percentage ranged from 13.4% (SE = 0.8) for transit stops to 52.8% (SE = 1.1) for shops among those without the support. One or more demographic differences were observed for the presence of each support, and the presence of all supports differed by education and metro status. Demographic patterns were less clear when examining usefulness and patterns often differed by support type and presence.

Conclusion: Presence and usefulness of neighborhood supports for walking can differ by type and demographic characteristics. Recognizing these difference can help communities plan and implement strategies to promote walking.

Keywords

built environment; walkability; health behavior; health determinants

---

Despite the health benefits of physical activity,[1] only one-half of U.S. adults meet the guideline for aerobic physical activity.[2] Walking is an excellent way for most people to be physically active.[3] In 2010, 62% of U.S. adults reported walking 10 minutes or more in the

---

Carlson (clo3@CDC.GOV) is corresponding author.

past week for transportation or leisure.[4] Adults with more education, those who were white, and those who were younger were more likely than their counterparts to report walking.[4]

Community and street design policies are recommended approaches for increasing physical activity, including walking, through improvements to environmental features.[5,6] Walking has been associated with environmental features such as distance to shops and services; street connectivity; aesthetics; and access to parks, trails, and recreational facilities.[7–9] While the use of public transit may promote increased walking,[10–13] fear of crime or perceptions of an unsafe neighborhood may be potential barriers to walking.[14,15] Some studies have also shown that traffic-related fears discourage walking,[8,16] and physical environments that include barriers such as a lack of sidewalks and crosswalks, poor lighting, and streets with high-speed traffic can contribute to increased pedestrian risk.[17–19]

Identifying how access to neighborhood walking supports differs by demographic characteristics is an important step in identifying where disparities in access exist; however, decision makers also need to know if the support is used or would be used for walking. This information, especially when examined by population subgroups, can help programs and communities focus their efforts to promote walking and identify the relevance and demand for specific supports overall and by subgroups. While some studies have examined demographic patterns in the use of specific supports, such as public transportation[20] and parks,[21] report of usefulness among those with and without access has not been systematically examined across a variety of neighborhood walking supports.

To our knowledge, no national survey has been conducted that collects information about both the presence and usefulness of neighborhood walking supports. Our study is based on a nationwide sample of U.S. adults and focuses on 8 neighborhood supports for walking: shops within easy walking distance; transit stop within a 10- to 15-minute walk; sidewalks on most streets; parks, green spaces, or trails; interesting things to look at; well-lit at night; low crime rate; and cars following the speed limit. We describe the reported presence of these supports and the usefulness (ie, use or potential use) of these supports for walking. We examine differences by sex, age, metro status, race/ethnicity, and education level and highlight where differences by these characteristics exist.

Methods

Design

Data came from the summer wave of Porter Novelli's 2014 ConsumerStyles database, called SummerStyles. Each year, the database is built from a series of web-based surveys that gather insights about U.S. consumers, including information about health attitudes and behaviors. In 2014, the spring wave of the survey was conducted among 6713 adults age 18 or older who belong to the GfK Knowledge Panel. Panel members are randomly recruited through probability-based sampling and membership is continuously replenished to maintain about 55,000 panelists.

The SummerStyles survey was sent during June and July to 6159 adults who completed the spring wave. Survey completion took approximately 36 minutes. Those who completed

the survey received reward points worth approximately $10 and were eligible to win an in-kind prize through a monthly sweepstakes. The CDC licensed the results of the 2014 SummerStyles survey after data were collected. Analyses of these data were exempt from institutional review board approval because personal identifiers were not included in the data file.

The SummerStyles database contains survey weights for each respondent. These weights adjust for the probability of selection and nonresponse. Data were weighted to match 2014 U.S. Current Population Survey (CPS) proportions for age (18–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–64, 65+), sex, MSA status (nonmetro, metro), race/ethnicity (white non-Hispanic, black non-Hispanic, other non-Hispanic, Hispanic, 2+ races non-Hispanic), education level (less than high school, high school graduate, some college, college graduate), census region (Northeast, Midwest, South, West), household size (1, 2, 3, 4, 5+), household income (< $25,000, $25,000–$39,000, $40,000–$59,000, $60,000), and whether a respondent had Internet access before joining the panel.

Sample

A total of 4269 summer surveys were returned (response rate: 69%). Respondents whose questionnaires were missing data on presence of neighborhood walking supports (n = 74), walking frequency (n = 21), or both (n = 8) were excluded from the analysis. The resulting sample with nonmissing data consisted of 4166 respondents. Adults who reported being physically unable to walk for at least 10 minutes were excluded (n = 193).

Measures

Presence of Supports.—The presence of neighborhood supports was assessed by respondents selecting which (if any) of the following statements were true about their neighborhood:

- There are many shops, stores, markets, or other places to buy things within easy walking distance of my home

- There is a transit stop within a 10 to 15 minute walk from my home

- There are sidewalks on most of the streets in my neighborhood

- My neighborhood has parks, green spaces, or trails for walking

- The crime rate in my neighborhood is low

- There are many interesting things to look at while walking in my neighborhood

- It is safe to walk in my neighborhood because many drivers follow the posted speed limits

- My neighborhood is well-lit at night

- None of these.

Use of Support or Support Is Reason for Walking.—For the supports identified as present, respondents were asked this follow-up question: "Below is the list of amenities that you indicated are available in your neighborhood. Which, if any, do you currently use/do?"

- I walk to nearby shops, stores, markets or other places to buy things

- I walk to the transit stop

- I walk on the sidewalks

- I use the parks, green spaces, or trails for walking

- I walk because of the low crime rate

- I walk because there are many interesting things to look at in my neighborhood

- I walk because drivers follow the posted speed limits

- I walk because my neighborhood is well-lit at night

- None of these.

Potential Use of Support or Support Would Be Reason for Walking.—For the supports not identified as present, respondents were asked this follow-up question: "Below is the list of amenities that you indicated are not available in your neighborhood. Which, if any, of these would you use/do if they were available?"

- I would walk to nearby shops, stores, markets or other places to buy things.

- I would walk to a transit stop

- I would walk on sidewalks

- I would use parks, green spaces, or trails for walking

- I would walk if the crime rate was low

- I would walk if there were many interesting things to look at in my neighborhood

- I would walk if drivers followed the posted speed limits

- I would walk if my neighborhood was well-lit at night

- None of these.

Demographic Variables.—Categorical variables for demographic characteristics included: sex (men, women), age group (18–34, 35–49, 50–64, 65 years), metropolitan statistical area (MSA) status (metro, nonmetro), race/ethnicity (white non-Hispanic, black non-Hispanic, other), education (high school graduate or less, some college, college graduate), and region (Northeast, Midwest, South, West).[22] MSA status is based on a person's location of residence, which is defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.[23]

Analysis

The percentage of adults reporting each neighborhood support as present was examined by demographic characteristics. In addition, the percentage of adults using or reporting the support was a reason for walking was examined among adults identifying the support as present, and the percentage of adults reporting they would use or the support would be a reason for walking was examined among adults not reporting the support as present.

Logistic regression analyses were conducted for each neighborhood support to examine the association between demographic characteristics and the presence of each support. Among adults reporting the support, odds of using the support was examined by demographic characteristics. Among adults not reporting the support, odds of potentially using the support was examined by demographic characteristics. All models were adjusted for sex, age group, MSA status, race/ethnicity, education, and region.

Orthogonal polynomial contrasts and pairwise *t* tests were used to identify significant trends and differences by subgroups. Survey weights were applied for all analyses except for when unweighted sample sizes were presented. Analyses were conducted using SUDAAN, version 11.0 (Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC) to account for survey weights.

Results

The majority of the sample was white non-Hispanic, had some college education or was a college graduate, and lived within a metro MSA (Table 1). The demographic distribution of the unweighted sample differed some from that of the sample weighted to the US adult population (Table 1). These differences were most pronounced by age (especially those 18 to 34 years) and race/ethnicity (white non-Hispanic and other).

The percentage of adults who reported neighborhood supports for walking ranged from 25.3% (interesting things to look at) to 55.8% (low crime rate, Table 2). For adults with the support, the percentage of adults who reported they used the support or the support was a reason for walking ranged from 24.6% (transit stops) to 79.0% (sidewalks). For adults who did not report the support as present, the percentage who reported the support would be used or be a reason for walking ranged from 13.4% (transit stops) to 52.8% (shops within walking distance).

When reporting the presence of a support, men were more likely to indicate the presence of a low crime rate and a well-lit neighborhood at night than women (Table 2). For adults with the support, no differences in the percentage of adults who reported using the support were found by sex. For adults who did not report the support as present, women were more likely than men to report they would use a support or it would be a reason for walking for all supports except transit stops.

The percentage of adults who reported the presence of all supports was higher for those living in a metro MSA than for those living in a nonmetro MSA (Table 2). When adjusted odds were examined, adults living in a metro MSA were significantly more likely than those

living in a nonmetro MSA to report the presence of all supports except for interesting things to look at. For adults with the support, a higher percentage of adults living in a metro MSA than those living in a nonmetro MSA reported a low crime rate as a reason for walking. However, this association was borderline not significant (P = .05) after models were adjusted for demographic characteristics. For adults who did not report the supports as present, those living in a metro MSA were more likely than those living in a nonmetro MSA to report they would walk to shops and in parks if these supports were available.

The odds of the presence of shops were higher for younger age groups, while the odds of a low crime rate, cars following the speed limit, and a well-lit neighborhood at night were higher for older age groups (Table 3). The odds of the presence of transit stops were higher for adults aged 50 to 64 than those aged 65 years or older. They were lower for adults aged 18 to 34 than those aged 50 to 65 and 65 years or older for interesting things to look at. For adults with the support, the odds of reporting walking in parks was higher for adults aged 35 to 49 than those aged 50 to 64 years, as well as for those aged 18 to 34 and 35 to 49 years than those aged 65 years or older. For adults who did not report the support as present, the odds of reporting they would walk to shops and in parks if these supports were available was lowest for adults aged 65 years or older compared with all other age groups, and the odds of reporting a well-lit neighborhood at night as a potential reason for walking decreased as age increased.

The odds of reporting shops within walking distance, transit stops, and sidewalks as present were higher for non-Hispanic blacks than non-Hispanic whites (Table 4). Non-Hispanic blacks were less likely than non-Hispanic whites to report a low crime rate. For adults with the support, the odds of reporting walking to transit stops was higher for non-Hispanic blacks than non-Hispanic whites. For adults who did not report the support as present, the odds of reporting interesting things to look at as a potential reason for walking was higher for non-Hispanic blacks than non-Hispanic whites.

The odds of reporting a support as present increased as education level increased for all supports except shops within walking distance (Table 5). For adults with the support, the odds of reporting sidewalks, parks, and a low crime rate as useful to walking behavior increased as education level increased and for shops within walking distance, the odds was significantly higher for college graduates than high school graduates or less. For adults who did not report the support as present, the odds of reporting shops, transit stops, sidewalks, parks, and interesting things to look at as potentially useful to their walking increased as education level increased.

Discussion

Our study found 1 or more demographic differences in the presence of each support, and the presence of all supports differed by education level and MSA status. Demographic patterns were less clear when examining usefulness of these supports, and patterns often differed by type of support and whether the support was present. For example, about 70% of U.S. adults overall did not report having transit stops and shops within easy walking distance, with differences for each by age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, and education. However, only 13%

of those not identifying transit stops in their neighborhoods reported that a transit stop would be walked to if available, with differences found only by education. In contrast, about half of adults not identifying shops within easy walking distance in their neighborhoods reported they would walk to shops if they were available, with differences by sex, age, MSA status, and education. Knowing how the reported supply and use or potential use of neighborhood supports differ according to the type of support and by demographic characteristics can help decision makers better estimate the potential reach and breadth of initiatives to create more walkable communities.

Adults with lower education have a lower prevalence of walking and physical activity overall, and our results show that they have less access to neighborhood supports for walking.[4,24] In addition to differences in the presence of supports by education level, we also found differences in the use and potential use of these supports. Better understanding of the reasons why the reported supply and usefulness for neighborhood supports differ by education level may be an important area for continued research.

Our findings on the presence of neighborhood supports for walking among U.S. adults are consistent with other national estimates. According to the 2012 National Survey of Bicyclist and Pedestrian Attitudes and Behavior, 52% of people aged 16 years or older reported that sidewalks existed along almost all or most streets in their neighborhood.[25] In our study, about 50% of respondents reported sidewalks on most streets in their neighborhood. A similar study that used 2012 HealthStyles data found that 32% of adults reported interesting things to look at while walking in their neighborhood, 29% reported many places to go within easy walking distance, 26% reported that it is easy to walk to a transit stops and 25% reported that stores they like are within easy walking distance of home.[26] This study also reported patterns in demographic characteristics similar to our study.[26]

Our study examined use and potential use of 8 neighborhood supports, after stratifying by the presence of the support. Capturing reported use and potential use of 8 neighborhood supports in 1 study is quite unique, thus making it difficult to compare our findings about use and potential use with other studies. However, studies that examined these concepts for specific supports have found similar results.[21,27] For example, a study of park users found that older adults were less likely to use parks and similarly, we found that older adults were less likely to report using or potentially using a park for walking.[21] Another study found people living in rural areas were less likely than those in small or midsize towns to want to live in an activity-friendly community (described as having a town center with shops, restaurants, public transit, and other buildings or surrounded by residential neighborhoods with easy access to work and shopping).[27] Similarly, we found that adults living in a metro MSA where shops were not within walking distance were more likely than their counterparts living in a nonmetro MSA to report they would walk to shops.

The differences we found in both reported presence and use or potential use of neighborhood supports highlight the importance of program planners conducting comprehensive assessments to identify what community members have and want to maximize the success of these initiatives. Identifying community initiatives that use recommended and evidence-based strategies, while also considering local demands and available resources, may be an

important first step to planning successful programs to promote walking. If a neighborhood support exists, but certain population subgroups do not use it, different interventions that may promote its use may be needed in these communities. Conversely, if subgroups do not have a support present but report it as useful, they may benefit most from a policy or program that provides that support. Knowing how reports of supports and their use or potential use differ by demographic characteristics can help communities choose and tailor strategies most relevant for their population.

This study has several limitations. A sample selection bias may be associated with the use of data from an online panel. There may be concern that the use of an online collection system may result in the exclusion of adults without Internet access. To address this concern, households were offered laptop computers and access to the Internet (if needed); however, we did find that the percentage of adults living in households without Internet access was slightly lower among survey respondents (15%) compared with the 2012 adults estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau (21%).[28] In addition, we found differences in the distribution of certain demographic characteristics between sample respondents (unweighted percentages) and the U.S. adult population (weighted percentages). The application of the survey weights can help to mitigate this bias although it is likely that some amount of selection bias remains. In addition, previous research that compared results between random-digit-dialing and panel approaches found a general equivalence between results, suggesting that findings from panel studies are as acceptable as those using respondents selected randomly for telephone surveys.[29,30] Another limitation is that the questions used to assess neighborhood supports for walking do not have any information to confirm their reliability and validity. However, similar surveys, such as the Physical Activity Neighborhood Environment Survey, that use single questions to ask about the presence of similar features have shown good evidence of reliability.[31] Finally, the way perceptions of usefulness was assessed differed slightly for different supports and for those with and without supports. For half of the supports (shops within walking distance, transit stops, sidewalks, and parks), the survey asked whether the support was being used or would be used (for those without the support); for the other half (interesting things to look at, well-lit at night, low crime rate, and cars following the speed limit), the survey asked if the support was the reason or would be the reason (for those without the support) for walking. We are not sure how this difference influenced our results, but future work may need to examine systematic methods to assess people's perceptions about the role these supports can play in promoting walking.

This study also has several strengths. First, data about use and potential use of multiple neighborhood supports on walking behavior were available. To our knowledge, this information has not been collected or reported from a nationwide sample. Furthermore, no previous study has examined the association between demographics and both presence and use or potential use of neighborhood supports for walking. In addition, our sample size was fairly large, which allowed us to look at differences by many different demographic characteristics and to control our models for many covariates when examining associations.

Conclusion

Overall, about half of the adults in our study sample had access to at least 1 support
for walking in their community, and many differences in the presence of these supports
existed by sex, age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, and education, as well as by type of
support. Demographic patterns were less clear when examining use and potential use with
differences depending on the type of support, the presence of the support, and demographic
characteristic. Because both reported presence and use or potential use of neighborhood
supports can differ according to demographic characteristics, a community assessment of
both may be needed to guide the planning and implementation of programs designed to
promote walking. Recognizing these differences can help communities plan and implement
strategies to promote walking that are most relevant to the residents of the community.

Acknowledgments

References

1. Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory
Committee Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services; 2008.

2. Blackwell DL, Lucas JW, Clarke TC. Summary health statistics for U.S. adults: National Health
Interview Survey, 2012. Vital Health Stat. 2014;10(260):80–82.

3. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Step It Up! The Surgeon General's Call to Action
to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept of Health and Human
Services, Office of the Surgeon General; 2015.

4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital signs: walking among adults — United States,
2005 and 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2012;61(31):595–601. [PubMed: 22874838]

5. Community Preventive Services Task Force. The Guide to Community Preventive
Services website. Increasing Physical Activity: Environmental and Policy Approaches. http://
www.thecommunityguide.org/pa/environmental-policy/index.html. Accessed November 5, 2014.

6. Heath GW, Brownson RC, Kruger J, et al. The effectiveness of urban design and land use and
transport policies and practices to increase physical activity: a systematic review. J Phys Act Health.
2006;3(suppl 1):S55–S76. doi:10.1123/jpah.3.s1.s55 [PubMed: 28834525]

7. Saelens BE, Handy SL. Built environment correlates of walking: a review. Med Sci Sports Exerc.
2008;40(suppl 7):S550–S566. PubMed doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e31817c67a4 [PubMed: 18562973]

8. Owen N, Humpel N, Leslie E, Bauman A, Sallis JF. Understanding environmental influences on
walking: Review and research agenda. Am J Prev Med. 2004;27(1):67–76. PubMed doi:10.1016/
j.amepre.2004.03.006 [PubMed: 15212778]

9. Sugiyama T, Neuhaus M, Cole R, Giles-Corti B, Owen N. Destination and route attributes
associated with adults' walking: a review. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2012;44(7):1275–1286. PubMed
doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e318247d286 [PubMed: 22217568]

10. Lachapelle U, Frank L, Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Conway TL. Commuting by public transit and
physical activity: where you live, where you work, and how you get there. J Phys Act Health.
2011;8(suppl 1):S72–S82. PubMed doi:10.1123/jpah.8.s1.s72 [PubMed: 21350265]

11. Brown BB, Werner CM. A new rail stop: tracking moderate physical activity bouts and ridership.
Am J Prev Med. 2007;33(4):306–309. PubMed doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2007.06.002 [PubMed:
17888857]

12. Hoehner CM, Brennan Ramirez LK, Elliott MB, Handy SL, Brownson RC. Perceived and
objective environmental measures and physical activity among urban adults. Am J Prev Med.
2005;28(suppl 2):105–116. PubMed doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2004.10.023 [PubMed: 15694518]

13. Freeland AL, Banerjee SN, Dannenberg AL, Wendel AM. Walking associated with public transit: moving toward increased physical activity in the United States. Am J Public Health. 2013;103(3):536–542. PubMed doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300912 [PubMed: 23327281]

14. Foster S, Knuiman M, Hooper P, Christian H, Giles-Corti B. Do changes in residents' fear of crime impact their walking? Longitudinal results from RESIDE. Prev Med. 2014;62:161–166. PubMed doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.02.011 [PubMed: 24552845]

15. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Neighborhood safety and the prevalence of physical inactivity — selected states, 1996. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 1999;48(07):143–146. [PubMed: 10077460]

16. McCormack GR, Shiell A. In search of causality: a systematic review of the relationship between the built environment and physical activity among adults. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2011;8:125. PubMed doi:10.1186/1479-5868-8-125 [PubMed: 22077952]

17. Karsch HM, Hedlund JH, Tison J, Leaf WA. Review of Studies on Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety, 1991–2007. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration;2012. Report No. DOT HS 811 614.

18. Pollack KM, Bailey MM, Gielen AC, et al. Building safety into active living initiatives. Prev Med. 2014;69(suppl 1):S102–S105. PubMed doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.08.010 [PubMed: 25117526]

19. World Health Organization. Pedestrian Safety: A Road Safety Manual for Decision Makers and Practitioners. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2013.

20. Zwald ML, Hipp JA, Corseuil MW, Dodson EA. Correlates of walking for transportation and use of public transportation among adults in St Louis, Missouri, 2012. Prev Chronic Dis. 2014;11:E112. PubMed doi:10.5888/pcd11.140125 [PubMed: 24995654]

21. Cohen DA, McKenzie TL, Sehgal A, Williamson S, Golinelli D, Lurie N. Contribution of public parks to physical activity. Am J Public Health. 2007;97(3):509–514. PubMed doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.072447 [PubMed: 17267728]

22. U.S. Census Bureau. 2010 Geographic Terms and Concepts—Census Divisions and Census Regions. https://www.census.gov/geo/reference/gtc/gtc_census_divreg.html. Accessed October 5, 2015.

23. U.S. Census Bureau. About Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas. http://www.census.gov/population/metro/about/. Accessed October 5, 2015.

24. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy People 2020 website. http://www.healthypeople.gov/. Accessed April 14, 2015.

25. Schroeder P, Wilbur M. 2012 National Survey of Bicyclist and Pedestrian Attitudes and Behavior. Summary Report. Vol 1. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 2013.

26. Paul P, Carlson SA, Fulton JE. Walking and perception of safety and environmental attributes among U.S. adults, 2012. J Phys Act Health. 2017;14(1):36–44. doi:10.1123/jpah.2015-0685 [PubMed: 27775464]

27. Librett JJ, Yore MM, Schmid TL, Kohl HW 3rd. Are self-reported physical activity levels associated with perceived desirability of activity-friendly communities? Health Place. 2007;13(3):767–773. PubMed doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2006.07.003 [PubMed: 16935021]

28. U.S. Census Bureau. Table 1. Reported Internet Usage for Individuals 3 Years and Older, by Selected Characteristics: 2012. http://www.census.gov/data/tables/2012/demo/computer-internet/computer-use-2012.html. Accessed October 5, 2015.

29. Pollard W Use of consumer panel survey data for public health communication planning; an evaluation of survey results. Proceedings of the Section on Health Policy Statistics. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association; 2002:2720–2724.

30. Fisher L, Kane N. Consumer Panelist Versus Random Digit Dial Respondent Performance Revisited: How Similar and How Different? New York, NY: Synovate, Inc.;2004. Research on Research #64.

31. Sallis JF, Kerr J, Carlson JA, et al. Evaluating a brief self-report measure of neighborhood environments for physical activity research and surveillance: Physical Activity Neighborhood Environment Scale (PANES). J Phys Act Health. 2010;7(4):533–540. PubMed doi:10.1123/jpah.7.4.533 [PubMed: 20683096]

Table 1

Characteristics of Analytic Sample of U.S. Adults, SummerStyles Survey, 2014[a]

Characteristic	Unweighted		Weighted	
	Sample Size	%	%	SE
Total	3973	100.0	100.0	
Sex				
Men	1951	49.1	48.3	0.9
Women	2022	50.9	51.7	0.9
Age (years)				
18–34	688	17.3	30.5	1.0
35–49	1119	28.2	24.5	0.8
50–64	1345	33.9	27.8	0.8
65+	821	20.7	17.3	0.6
Metropolitan statistical area (MSA) status				
Nonmetro MSA	615	15.5	15.2	0.7
Metro MSA	3358	84.5	84.8	0.7
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	2997	75.4	66.5	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	368	9.3	11.1	0.6
Other[b]	608	15.3	22.4	0.9
Education level				
High school graduate or less	1391	35.0	40.8	1.0
Some college	1246	31.4	29.6	0.8
College graduate	1336	33.6	29.6	0.8
Region				
Northeast	702	17.7	18.1	0.7
Midwest	1003	25.2	21.3	0.7
South	1403	35.3	36.8	0.9
West	865	21.8	23.8	0.8

Abbreviations: SE, standard error.

[a]296 respondents were excluded for missing data (n = 103) or because they indicated they were unable to walk when asked about how often they usually walk for at least 10 minutes at a time (n = 193).

[b]Other race/ethnicity includes Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

Table 2

Presence and Use or Potential Use of the Support, by Sex and Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Status, SummerStyles Survey, 2014

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Overall		Sex						MSA Status					
			Weighted Percent				Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] Men (Referent Group: Women)		Weighted Percent				Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] Nonmetro (Referent Group: Metro)	
			Men		Women				Nonmetro		Metro			
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI
Reported neighborhood support present: [b]														
Shops within easy walking distance	31.0	0.9	31.6	1.3	30.4	1.2	1.05	0.88, 1.24	17.0	1.9	33.5	1.0	0.50	0.38, 0.65
Transit stop within 10–15 minute walk	36.1	0.9	36.7	1.3	35.5	1.3	1.04	0.88, 1.22	9.5	1.4	40.8	1.0	0.19	0.13, 0.27
Sidewalks on most streets	49.5	1.0	49.8	1.4	49.3	1.3	1.00	0.86, 1.17	24.1	2.1	54.1	1.0	0.30	0.24, 0.39
Park, green space, or trail for walking	40.3	0.9	41.8	1.3	39.0	1.3	1.11	0.95, 1.31	21.8	2.0	43.6	1.0	0.41	0.32, 0.53
Interesting things to look at	25.3	0.8	24.1	1.1	26.5	1.1	0.88	0.74, 1.04	21.0	1.9	26.1	0.9	0.83	0.65, 1.06
Well-lit at night	29.1	0.9	31.1	1.2	27.2	1.2	1.22	1.03, 1.44	17.3	1.8	31.2	1.0	0.48	0.37, 0.63
Low crime rate	55.8	1.0	57.8	1.4	53.9	1.3	1.20	1.02, 2.04	50.4	2.4	56.8	1.0	0.72	0.58, 0.89
Cars following the speed limit	33.5	0.9	33.9	1.3	33.1	1.3	1.04	0.89, 1.22	26.0	2.1	34.8	1.0	0.67	0.53, 0.85
Among adults who report the support as present, reporting that they walk: [c]														
To nearby shops	58.4	1.7	61.6	2.4	55.3	2.5	1.25	0.94, 1.66	52.6	6.2	59.0	1.8	0.82	0.48, 1.40
To transit stop	24.6	1.4	25.5	1.9	23.8	1.9	1.13	0.83, 1.52	22.8	6.4	24.7	1.4	1.00	0.47, 2.12
On sidewalk	79.0	1.1	78.7	1.6	79.4	1.6	0.95	0.72, 1.25	79.5	4.3	79.0	1.2	1.03	0.58, 1.85
At park, green space, or trail	59.0	1.5	60.0	2.0	58.0	2.1	1.07	0.84, 1.37	51.1	5.1	59.7	1.5	0.74	0.48, 1.14
Because of interesting things to look at	50.0	1.8	48.4	2.6	51.3	2.4	0.89	0.67, 1.18	52.0	4.9	49.7	1.9	1.18	0.78, 1.79
Because well-lit at night	36.6	1.7	34.9	2.3	38.4	2.6	0.87	0.65, 1.17	33.3	5.6	36.9	1.8	0.93	0.56, 1.44
Because low crime rate	33.1	1.1	31.7	1.6	34.5	1.7	0.87	0.71, 1.06	26.5	2.8	34.1	1.3	0.74	0.54, 1.00
Because cars follow speed limit	26.7	1.4	28.5	2.0	25.1	2.0	1.20	0.90, 1.59	24.4	4.3	27.1	1.5	0.92	0.56, 1.52
Among adults who did not report the support as present, report that if the support was available they would walk: [d]														
To nearby shops	52.8	1.1	49.8	1.6	55.6	1.6	0.79	0.66, 0.94	44.3	2.6	54.7	1.3	0.70	0.55, 0.88
To transit stop	13.4	0.8	12.3	1.1	14.5	1.2	0.82	0.62, 1.10	11.2	1.6	14.0	1.0	0.98	0.68, 1.41

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Overall		Sex						MSA Status					
			Weighted Percent				Adjusted Odds Ratio [a]		Weighted Percent				Adjusted Odds Ratio [a]	
			Men		Women		Men (Referent Group: Women)		Nonmetro		Metro		Nonmetro (Referent Group: Metro)	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI
On sidewalk	49.5	1.4	42.5	1.9	55.9	1.9	0.58	0.47, 0.72	47.2	2.7	50.1	1.6	0.87	0.67, 1.13
At park, green space, or trail	45.8	1.2	41.0	1.8	50.0	1.7	0.69	0.57, 0.85	39.7	2.6	47.3	1.4	0.75	0.59, 0.97
If interesting things to look at	30.0	1.0	27.6	1.4	32.3	1.5	0.81	0.66, 0.98	25.7	2.4	30.8	1.1	0.82	0.62, 1.09
If well-lit at night	27.6	1.0	22.9	1.4	31.7	1.4	0.64	0.52, 0.79	23.4	2.3	28.5	1.1	0.79	0.60, 1.05
If low crime rate	24.5	1.3	19.4	1.7	28.9	1.8	0.58	0.44, 0.77	22.9	3.1	24.9	1.4	0.97	0.66, 1.45
If cars followed the speed limit	18.3	0.9	15.5	1.3	20.9	1.3	0.69	0.54, 0.88	18.9	2.3	18.2	1.0	1.07	0.77, 1.50

Abbreviations: SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval.

[a] All models adjusted for sex, age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, education level, and region as categorized in Table 1.

[b] A neighborhood support was categorized as present if the respondents selected it when asked to identify which (if any) were true about their neighborhood: many shops, stores, markets, or other places to buy things within easy walking distance; transit stop within a 10–15 minute walk; sidewalks on most of the streets; parks, green spaces, or trails for walking; low crime rate; many interesting things to look at while walking; safe because many drivers follow the posted speed limits; and well-lit at night.

[c] For supports identified as present, respondents were asked to select which (if any) they currently use or do because the support is present.

[d] For supports not identified as present, they were asked to select which (if any) they would use or do if the support was available.

Table 3

Presence of a Neighborhood Walking Support and Use or Potential Use of the Support, by Age Group, SummerStyles Survey, 2014*

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Weighted Percent by Age Group (years)								Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] (Referent Group: 65+)					
	18–34		35–49		50–64		65+		18–34		35–49		50–64	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Reported neighborhood support present:[b]														
Shops within easy walking distance	34.3	2.0	33.3	1.7	29.2	1.4	24.8	1.7	1.42	1.10, 1.84	1.36	1.07, 1.73	1.17	0.93, 1.47
Transit stop within 10–15 minute walk	36.5	2.0	36.3	1.7	38.2	1.5	31.6	1.8	1.09	0.85, 1.41	1.04	0.82, 1.32	1.28	1.03, 1.59
Sidewalks on most streets	50.0	2.1	52.2	1.8	49.0	1.6	45.7	1.9	1.11	0.88, 1.41	1.15	0.92, 1.43	1.11	0.90, 1.36
Park, green space, or trail for walking	38.2	2.0	43.4	1.8	40.1	1.5	40.1	1.9	0.85	0.67, 1.07	0.99	0.79, 1.23	0.97	0.79, 1.18
Interesting things to look at	20.1	1.6	25.9	1.6	29.0	1.4	27.9	1.7	0.65	0.50, 0.85	0.82	0.65, 1.04	1.04	0.83, 1.30
Well-lit at night	26.3	1.9	29.2	1.6	29.0	1.4	33.8	1.9	0.67	0.52, 0.87	0.75	0.59, 0.94	0.79	0.63, 0.97
Low crime rate	46.7	2.1	55.6	1.8	60.6	1.6	64.4	1.9	0.52	0.41, 0.66	0.68	0.55, 0.86	0.90	0.73, 1.11
Cars following the speed limit	27.2	1.9	35.3	1.7	34.4	1.5	40.6	1.9	0.54	0.42, 0.69	0.74	0.60, 0.92	0.76	0.62, 0.93
Among adults who report the support as present, reporting that they walk:[c]														
To nearby shops	62.1	3.6	57.6	3.1	58.2	2.9	51.7	4.0	1.49	0.97, 2.29	1.16	0.77, 1.74	1.24	0.84, 1.83
To transit stop	27.0	3.0	23.9	2.6	25.2	2.3	19.8	2.8	1.47	0.91, 2.36	1.26	0.79, 2.00	1.28	0.83, 1.97
On sidewalk	79.2	2.5	79.1	2.1	80.6	1.8	75.8	2.5	1.27	0.85, 1.90	1.18	0.81, 1.74	1.34	0.93, 1.92
At park, green space, or trail	62.2	3.3	65.1	2.7	56.2	2.4	48.8	3.1	1.81	1.25, 2.62	1.92	1.37, 2.69	1.36	1.00, 1.86
Because of interesting things to look at	32.7	2.2	31.2	2.0	27.9	1.6	26.0	2.0	1.41	1.05, 1.88	1.24	0.94, 1.63	1.07	0.82, 1.39
Because well-lit at night	36.0	4.1	35.3	3.1	37.7	2.8	37.6	3.4	0.89	0.57, 1.41	0.91	0.61, 1.35	1.00	0.69, 1.44
Because low crime rate	34.2	2.9	32.7	2.2	34.3	1.8	30.4	2.2	1.19	0.86, 1.64	1.06	0.79, 1.41	1.20	0.92, 1.56
Because cars follow speed limit	23.1	3.4	25.0	2.6	29.5	2.5	29.5	2.8	0.71	0.44, 1.13	0.75	0.51, 1.11	0.97	0.67, 1.38
Among adults who did not report the support as present, report that if the support was available they would walk:[d]														
To nearby shops	51.3	2.6	58.3	2.2	54.9	1.8	45.2	2.2	1.33	1.01, 1.75	1.66	1.29, 2.13	1.50	1.20, 1.89
To transit stop	14.8	1.9	14.5	1.7	12.5	1.3	11.1	1.4	1.38	0.91, 2.10	1.16	0.78, 1.72	1.06	0.74, 1.53
On sidewalk	45.9	3.0	50.8	2.6	50.6	2.2	51.8	2.6	0.88	0.63, 1.23	0.99	0.73, 1.33	1.01	0.76, 1.33
At park, green space, or trail	47.2	2.7	47.6	2.4	47.9	2.0	37.4	2.4	1.55	1.15, 2.09	1.45	1.10, 1.92	1.58	1.21, 2.05
If interesting things to look at	42.3	4.3	53.2	3.5	50.5	2.9	54.7	3.7	0.62	0.39, 0.99	0.92	0.61, 1.39	0.86	0.58, 1.25

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Weighted Percent by Age Group (years)								Adjusted Odds Ratio[a] (Referent Group: 65+)					
	18–34		35–49		50–64		65+		18–34		35–49		50–64	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
If well-lit at night	30.8	2.2	29.5	1.9	26.2	1.6	20.8	2.0	1.69	1.22, 2.33	1.54	1.13, 2.10	1.35	1.00, 1.82
If low crime rate	28.0	2.5	20.3	2.2	25.0	2.3	22.1	2.9	1.44	0.94, 2.20	0.90	0.58, 1.39	1.19	0.79, 1.79
If cars followed the speed limit	17.0	1.8	16.8	1.6	21.3	1.7	18.0	1.9	0.90	0.62, 1.30	0.91	0.64, 1.29	1.22	0.89, 1.68

Abbreviations: SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval.

[a] All models adjusted for sex, age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, education level, and region as categorized in Table 1.

[b] A neighborhood support was categorized as present if the respondents selected it when asked to identify which (if any) were true about their neighborhood: many shops, stores, markets, or other places to buy things within easy walking distance; transit stop within a 10–15 minute walk; sidewalks on most of the streets; parks, green spaces, or trails for walking; low crime rate; many interesting things to look at while walking; safe because many drivers follow the posted speed limits; and well-lit at night.

[c] For supports identified as present, respondents were asked to select which (if any) they currently use or do because the support is present.

[d] For supports not identified as present, they were asked to select which (if any) they would use or do if the support was available.

Table 4

Presence of a Neighborhood Walking Support and Use or Potential Use of the Support, by Race / Ethnicity, SummerStyles Survey, 2014*

| Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence) | Weighted Percent by Race / Ethnicity | | | | | | Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] (Referent Group: White, non-Hispanic) | | | |
| | White, non-Hispanic | | Black, non-Hispanic | | Other | | Black, non-Hispanic | | Other | |
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Reported neighborhood support present: [b]										
Shops within easy walking distance	26.8	0.9	44.1	3.0	36.9	2.4	2.34	1.78, 3.08	1.29	1.02, 1.62
Transit stop within 10–15 minute walk	31.4	1.0	51.4	3.0	42.4	2.4	2.61	1.99, 3.42	1.20	0.95, 1.52
Sidewalks on most streets	47.0	1.1	57.8	3.0	53.0	2.4	1.67	1.28, 2.17	1.01	0.80, 1.26
Park, green space, or trail for walking	38.5	1.0	40.1	2.9	45.8	2.4	1.18	0.90, 1.54	1.18	0.94, 1.48
Interesting things to look at	26.5	0.9	23.2	2.5	22.9	2.0	0.93	0.69, 1.27	0.81	0.63, 1.05
Well-lit at night	28.7	1.0	29.3	2.7	29.9	2.2	1.03	0.77, 1.36	1.02	0.80, 1.29
Low crime rate	61.9	1.0	39.6	2.9	45.7	2.4	0.42	0.33, 0.54	0.55	0.44, 0.69
Cars following the speed limit	34.6	1.0	30.0	2.7	32.0	2.3	0.85	0.65, 1.11	0.91	0.72, 1.15
Among adults who report the support as present, reporting that they walk: [c]										
To nearby shops	56.8	2.0	59.1	4.6	61.7	4.0	1.23	0.81, 1.88	1.16	0.79, 1.71
To transit stop	22.2	1.6	38.1	4.0	21.9	3.0	2.66	1.78, 3.98	0.96	0.64, 1.43
On sidewalk	81.3	1.2	75.6	3.2	74.9	3.0	0.79	0.54, 1.18	0.72	0.50, 1.04
At park, green space, or trail	59.1	1.7	61.5	4.3	57.7	3.6	1.12	0.75, 1.68	0.89	0.64, 1.24
Because of interesting things to look at	50.4	2.0	52.5	6.1	47.5	4.9	1.22	0.71, 2.09	0.88	0.57, 1.36
Because well-lit at night	33.4	1.8	41.6	5.6	43.3	4.4	1.40	0.86, 2.27	1.52	1.02, 2.26
Because low crime rate	32.1	1.2	39.7	4.4	34.1	3.3	1.37	0.93, 2.01	1.03	0.75, 1.42
Because cars follow speed limit	25.6	1.5	33.6	5.0	27.3	3.8	1.52	0.94, 2.47	1.16	0.76, 1.78
Among adults who did not report the support as present, report that if the support was available they would walk: [d]										
To nearby shops	53.8	1.2	51.1	4.0	50.3	3.0	0.90	0.64, 1.26	0.83	0.63, 1.08
To transit stop	12.3	0.9	17.3	3.3	15.7	2.4	1.60	0.98, 2.60	1.21	0.80, 1.82
On sidewalk	51.5	1.5	47.3	4.8	43.8	3.6	0.79	0.52, 1.21	0.77	0.55, 1.08
At park, green space, or trail	46.5	1.4	41.8	3.9	45.5	3.3	0.76	0.54, 1.06	0.81	0.60, 1.08
If interesting things to look at	29.0	1.2	36.2	3.3	29.7	2.5	1.40	1.03, 1.91	0.98	0.74, 1.29

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Weighted Percent by Race / Ethnicity						Adjusted Odds Ratio[a] (Referent Group: White, non-Hispanic)			
	White, non-Hispanic		Black, non-Hispanic		Other		Black, non-Hispanic		Other	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
If well-lit at night	26.6	1.1	29.5	3.2	29.6	2.6	1.10	0.79, 1.53	1.01	0.75, 1.35
If low crime rate	22.6	1.5	28.2	3.6	26.5	2.9	1.34	0.90, 2.01	1.07	0.75, 1.55
If cars followed the speed limit	17.2	1.0	20.9	2.9	20.0	2.2	1.15	0.79, 1.67	1.25	0.90, 1.73

Abbreviations: SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval.

[a] All models adjusted for sex, age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, education level, and region as categorized in Table 1.

[b] A neighborhood support was categorized as present if the respondents selected it when asked to identify which (if any) were true about their neighborhood: many shops, stores, markets, or other places to buy things within easy walking distance; transit stop within a 10–15 minute walk; sidewalks on most of the streets; parks, green spaces, or trails for walking; low crime rate; many interesting things to look at while walking; safe because many drivers follow the posted speed limits; and well-lit at night.

[c] For supports identified as present, respondents were asked to select which (if any) they currently use or do because the support is present.

[d] For supports not identified as present, they were asked to select which (if any) they would use or do if the support was available.

Table 5

Presence of a Neighborhood Walking Support and Use or Potential Use of the Support, by Education Level, SummerStyles Survey, 2014*

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Weighted Percent by Education Level						Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] (Referent Group: High School Graduate or Less)			
	HS Graduate or Less		Some College		College Graduate		Some College		College Graduate	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Reported neighborhood support present: [b]										
Shops within easy walking distance	28.6	1.5	33.8	1.6	31.5	1.5	1.23	1.00, 1.62	1.08	0.88, 1.33
Transit stop within 10–15 minute walk	30.6	1.5	38.2	1.7	41.5	1.6	1.35	1.10, 1.66	1.48	1.21, 1.82
Sidewalks on most streets	42.2	1.6	52.8	1.7	56.4	1.6	1.47	1.21, 1.78	1.61	1.33, 1.95
Park, green space, or trail for walking	32.3	1.5	41.7	1.7	49.9	1.6	1.44	1.18, 1.75	1.92	1.59, 2.33
Interesting things to look at	17.5	1.2	27.8	1.5	33.7	1.5	1.82	1.46, 2.26	2.32	1.88, 2.86
Well-lit at night	25.5	1.4	28.9	1.5	34.1	1.5	1.18	0.96, 1.45	1.43	1.17, 1.74
Low crime rate	48.5	1.6	55.5	1.7	66.2	1.6	1.36	1.12, 1.64	2.02	1.66, 2.44
Cars following the speed limit	27.1	1.4	35.7	1.6	40.1	1.6	1.49	1.22, 1.82	1.71	1.41, 2.07
Among adults who report the support as present, reporting that they walk: [c]										
To nearby shops	53.6	3.1	60.1	2.8	62.7	2.9	1.28	0.92, 1.79	1.47	1.03, 2.10
To transit stop	21.7	2.5	27.9	2.5	24.7	2.2	1.45	0.98, 2.14	1.23	0.84, 1.78
On sidewalk	73.0	2.2	79.4	1.9	84.9	1.6	1.42	1.03, 1.97	2.05	1.46, 2.88
At park, green space, or trail	51.5	2.9	61.6	2.5	63.6	2.2	1.47	1.08, 2.01	1.60	1.19, 2.16
Because of interesting things to look at	47.2	3.6	46.2	3.1	55.1	2.8	0.99	0.68, 1.44	1.42	0.99, 2.05
Because well-lit at night	38.2	3.2	35.3	2.9	36.1	2.7	0.89	0.61, 1.29	0.95	0.67, 1.36
Because low crime rate	29.5	2.0	32.8	2.1	37.0	1.9	1.15	0.88, 1.50	1.39	1.08, 1.78
Because cars follow speed limit	26.5	2.7	24.0	2.3	29.4	2.3	0.92	0.62, 1.34	1.18	0.82, 1.68
Among adults who did not report the support as present, report that if the support was available they would walk: [d]										
To nearby shops	45.2	1.8	54.9	2.0	61.7	1.9	1.44	1.16, 1.80	1.80	1.45, 2.25
To transit stop	9.6	1.2	14.3	1.5	18.7	1.8	1.61	1.12, 2.31	2.22	1.55, 3.19
On sidewalk	44.9	2.1	50.6	2.5	56.6	2.5	1.25	0.96, 1.62	1.58	1.21, 2.07
At park, green space, or trail	37.7	1.8	49.9	2.2	56.1	2.3	1.59	1.26, 2.01	2.01	1.57, 2.56

Presence and Use or Potential Use of Neighborhood Supports (Stratified by Presence)	Weighted Percent by Education Level						Adjusted Odds Ratio [a] (Referent Group: High School Graduate or Less)			
	HS Graduate or Less		Some College		College Graduate		Some College		College Graduate	
	%	SE	%	SE	%	SE	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
If interesting things to look at	26.8	1.6	30.8	1.9	34.5	2.0	1.20	0.95, 1.52	1.42	1.12, 1.79
If well-lit at night	23.0	1.5	32.8	1.9	29.1	1.9	1.55	1.22, 1.99	1.31	1.02, 1.69
If low crime rate	21.3	1.8	29.9	2.5	24.1	2.5	1.54	1.12, 2.12	1.12	0.78, 1.61
If cars followed the speed limit	17.4	1.4	21.5	1.8	16.3	1.6	1.28	0.97, 1.70	0.92	0.68, 1.23

Abbreviations: SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval; HS, High school.

[a] All models adjusted for sex, age, MSA status, race/ethnicity, education level, and region as categorized in Table 1.

[b] A neighborhood support was categorized as present if the respondents selected it when asked to identify which (if any) were true about their neighborhood: many shops, stores, markets, or other places to buy things within easy walking distance; transit stop within a 10–15 minute walk; sidewalks on most of the streets; parks, green spaces, or trails for walking; low crime rate; many interesting things to look at while walking; safe because many drivers follow the posted speed limits; and well-lit at night.

[c] For supports identified as present, respondents were asked to select which (if any) they currently use or do because the support is present.

[d] For supports not identified as present, they were asked to select which (if any) they would use or do if the support was available.