

1 **THE REACH OF BICYCLING IN RURAL, SMALL, AND LOW-DENSITY PLACES**

2

3 Carolyn McAndrews, PhD, MCP, MS (Corresponding author)
4 Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Colorado Denver
5 Campus Box 126, PO Box 173364
6 Denver, CO 80217-3364
7 Office: (303) 315-1000
8 Fax: (303) 556-3687
9 carolyn.mcandrews@ucdenver.edu

10

11 Kenta Okuyama, MPH
12 Colorado School of Public Health
13 13001 E. 17th Place, Mail Stop B119
14 Aurora, CO 80045
15 Office: (303)-724-4585
16 kenta.okuyama@ucdenver.edu

17

18 Jill S. Litt, PhD
19 Environmental Studies Program, University of Colorado Boulder and
20 Colorado School of Public Health
21 4001 Discovery Drive, Mail Stop 397 UCB
22 Boulder, Colorado 80303
23 Office: 303-735-4519
24 Fax: 303-492-5207
25 jill.litt@colorado.edu

26

27

28 Word count: 5,929 words abstract/text/references + 3 tables x 250 words each = 6,679 words

29

30 Submission date: 20 July 2016

31 Revision date: 6 November 2016

1 ABSTRACT

2 Lessons derived from the urban experience of bicycling may not be broadly supportive of
3 bicycling in what we call rural, small, and low-density (RSLD) places because of differences in
4 built environment, social, and political contexts. In this study we investigated the hypothesis that
5 bicycling is primarily an urban activity. We used binary logistic regression to compare the
6 frequency of bicycling and the population characteristics of bicyclists across urban and RSLD
7 places. We used multiple operational definitions of urban-rural continua to examine whether the
8 results are sensitive to how RSLD places are defined. The data for bicycling are from the 2009
9 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), which was designed to represent the population of
10 the U.S. We found that bicycling is primarily—but not exclusively—an urban activity.
11 Moreover, women and youth were more likely to bicycle in RSLD places compared to urban
12 places. These findings suggest that an urban perspective on bicycling could limit the success of
13 initiatives aiming to increase the diversity of populations that bicycle. Developing a base of
14 empirical knowledge of bicycling in RSLD places is a necessary step toward developing more
15 inclusive and effective multimodal transportation strategies.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Key elements of bikeable places include supportive infrastructure, policy, education,
3 encouragement, and enforcement programs. To be successful, these elements need to be sensitive
4 to the local built environment, social, and political contexts. Yet, key aspects of the bikeability
5 paradigm may not be context-sensitive. In practice this paradigm skews toward the experiences
6 of urban places where the land use context is more supportive of the goal to increase bicycling
7 for utilitarian purposes. For instance, strategies such as increasing bicycle commuting, adopting
8 complete streets policies, and constructing on-street bicycle infrastructure networks have been
9 derived from places with high-density activity centers that support utilitarian bicycling. In
10 contrast, a different set of strategies such as paved highway shoulders and historic preservation
11 programming might be needed to support bicycling in what we call rural, small, and low-density
12 (RSLD) places where bicycling is more often considered a problem of tourism and recreation
13 rather than a problem of transportation, if it is considered a problem at all.

14 Providing empirical evidence about the patterns of bicycling in RSLD places is a
15 necessary step for developing more inclusive and effective transportation planning practices and
16 policies for multimodal transportation. Research and practice that accounts for bicycling among
17 RSLD populations is important because bicycling is a form of health-promoting physical
18 activity, a potential mechanism of economic development, and an important mode of travel for
19 people, especially youth, who do not have access to a vehicle.

20 In this study, we investigated the hypothesis that bicycling is primarily an urban activity.
21 We used binary logistic regression to compare the frequency of bicycling and the population
22 characteristics of bicyclists using two different definitions of urban-rural continua. The data for
23 bicycling are from the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), which was designed to
24 represent the population of the U.S. We used two dependent variables that represent different
25 levels of bicycling frequency: (1) bicycling only one or two times in the previous week; and (2)
26 bicycling three or more times in the previous week. Although the NHTS was not developed as a
27 survey of bicycling, it captures a wide range of RSLD environments in the U.S. as well as
28 utilitarian and recreational bicycle trips.

29 We use the RSLD construct to refer to a diverse set of places that include remote and
30 agricultural landscapes as well as low-density exurban and suburban settlements within
31 urbanized areas. Despite the heterogeneity of these places, they tend to share a reliance on
32 automobiles for their viability, and public transportation options are typically less developed than
33 in traditional cities. Because the RSLD concept is expansive and heterogeneous, we used two
34 different operational definitions of urban-rural continua to analyze the data: (1) Rural-Urban
35 Commuting Areas that emphasize the economic characteristics of places; and (2) population
36 density categories that represent the built environment context. In addition, we consider the
37 influence of places with significant recreational economies and retirement communities because
38 bicycling may be uniquely prevalent in these settings.

39

40 BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE

41 In the urban context, bicycling is usually framed as an alternative to motorized travel. This
42 framing may be suited to places where motorized traffic is problematic, but outside of cities

1 bicycling is not a clear substitute for car travel, and residents in RSLD places may have different
2 motivations and resource needs for bicycling.

3 Rural places are characterized by spatial dispersion of economic, social, and cultural
4 activities (1). With the exception of peak tourism periods, they generally do not have “urban”
5 transportation problems such as congestion, scarce parking, and noise and air pollution (2). Prior
6 studies about the concerns of rural transportation include questions of goods movement, heavy
7 vehicle impacts on infrastructure, externalities of industrial traffic, and social isolation (1-6). In
8 practice, mobility in rural places in the U.S. has been dominated by the automobile whereas
9 urban places have presented opportunities for a diverse multi-modal system that relies on
10 automobiles, transit, walking, bicycling and any variant of these modes (2).

11 In turn, prior research about bicycling has focused on bicycling for transportation and
12 bicycle commuting in the context of cities (7). Very few studies have given attention to
13 contemporary bicycling behaviors and attitudes among RSLD residents despite the fact that these
14 settings are fully engaged in dialogue about creating bikeable communities (8-9). Certain
15 national and statewide studies of bicycling have included variables representing rural and
16 suburban places. Pucher et al. investigated bicycling trends in the U.S. using Census definitions
17 of urban and rural places (10). This study found that the bike share of all trips was higher in
18 urban places compared to rural places (1.12% versus 0.78%), that rural places have a higher
19 percentage of recreational bike trips compared to urban places (61.5% versus 46.9%), and that
20 the share of workers making commute trips by bike is about four times as high in urban places
21 compared to rural places (0.60 versus 0.16).

22 Noland et al. conducted a survey-based study of bicycling for New Jersey, a state with a
23 range of dense urban places, low-density suburbs, and agricultural areas (11). The survey
24 included both recreational and utilitarian bicycle trips, and the majority of bicycle trips were for
25 recreation. With respect to area-level characteristics, urban, rural, and suburban categories were
26 not predictive of the propensity to bicycle, nor was the density of county roads. Consistent with
27 other research, personal characteristics of survey respondents were stronger determinants of
28 bicycling and bicycling frequency than environmental characteristics. Bicycling increased with
29 population density when controlling for personal and household factors, but bicycling was still
30 prevalent in low-density places.

31 Despite a lack of research focused on RSLD bicycling, examples from practice suggest
32 that it can be a culturally and economically significant form of transport and recreation for RSLD
33 residents. There are numerous examples of RSLD places making investments in bicycling, and
34 these example offer insight into some of the opportunities that RSLD places present. The
35 Cowboy Trail in northern Nebraska is among the longest rail trails in the country and is a
36 recreation and tourism asset for the state. The Tour de Farm in western Georgia promotes the
37 region’s agriculture industry and local economies. In South Carolina, the Lower Savannah
38 Council of Governments pursued a bicycle planning process and the resulting plan emphasized
39 widening and paving shoulders on county roads. RSLD bicycling tends to emphasize off-street
40 infrastructure, recreational bicycling, and bicycle programming and education strategies.
41 Traditional issues of safety, education, enforcement, and design are present but they may be
42 pursued with strategies that are distinct from those typically used in urban areas with higher

1 population densities. More research is needed to understand the effectiveness of these strategies
2 across the urban-rural continuum.

3 The Rails to Trails Conservancy, with financial support from bicycle advocacy groups,
4 conducted a study of active transportation in rural places in the U.S. Comparing all-trip mode
5 share and bicycle commute share across an urban-rural continuum, the authors found that
6 bicycling is “far more prevalent in rural places than many would expect” (9). However, Loh et
7 al. did not control for social and demographic factors (e.g., gender, age, and income) that are
8 known to influence estimates of the propensity to bicycle (9). Therefore, the study’s estimates for
9 rural places may not reflect the unique contributions of place on bicycling. In addition, the study
10 may be sensitive to the operational definition of the urban-rural continuum. In the current
11 analysis, we build on this previous approach by using multivariate regression analysis that
12 enables us to examine the independent effect of urban-rural status on bicycling frequency. In
13 addition, we used multiple operational definitions of urban-rural continua to examine whether
14 the results are sensitive to how RSLD places are defined.

16 **Physical Activity in RSLD Places**

17 The physical activity literature from public health draws attention to emerging goals to promote
18 bicycling in RSLD places. Research comparing overall levels of physical activity across urban
19 and RSLD places has generally found that physical *inactivity* is highest in rural places, and that
20 rural places are less likely to have specific resources and facilities, such as trails, that promote
21 physical activity (13-17). However, other studies have found that sprawl, a characteristic of
22 certain RSLD places, is not associated with physical inactivity (18).

23 A review study of physical activity and rural built environments found that research in
24 this area is limited. Prior research has been cross-sectional, has neglected older adults, and has
25 been limited in its geographic scope such that high-risk regions such as the Southeast and
26 Midwest have received relatively less attention. Moreover, prior research on rural physical
27 activity has used a mix of definitions to represent RSLD places, which makes it difficult to draw
28 conclusions from the various studies (14).

29 The implication is that existing research and professional practices do not adequately
30 understand bicycling outside of the urban context, which is a gap in knowledge that could limit
31 the success of multimodal and active transportation initiatives in RSLD places. For example, a
32 recent study about the effectiveness of the Safe Routes to School program found that “children in
33 rural communities often miss out on the health and academic benefits that Safe Routes to School
34 initiatives bring” (19).

35 Our study takes steps to address these gaps by using more fine-grained definitions of
36 urban and rural places as well as nationally-representative data for children, youth, and adults
37 (ages five and older). This empirical information can help bring RSLD bicycling into the
38 mainstream of multimodal transportation planning and research.

40 **DATA AND METHODS**

41 We used the 2009 National Household Travel Survey for this analysis because it captures both
42 utilitarian and recreational travel, is representative of the U.S. population (ages five and older),

1 and includes the widest range of urban and RSLD places. Our sample included all responding
2 individuals (N=285,634).

3 We note that an important limitation of this study is the likely underrepresentation of
4 populations that are least likely to be included in the NHTS, such as non-white respondents and
5 groups that are difficult to reach by telephone (20). We also note that the distinction between
6 recreational and utilitarian bicycling is not always clear and a bicycle trip may be motivated by
7 both reasons (12). The National Household Travel Survey distinguishes between four main types
8 of trips: work, shopping, social/recreational, and other. Social/recreational trips include
9 motivations such as leisure, exercising, relaxing, visiting friends, going out (e.g., entertainment,
10 bar, event), and visiting public places such as libraries and parks.

11 We conducted analyses with two different dependent variables: (1) self-reported
12 bicycling one or two times in the previous week (N=15,884); and (2) self-reported bicycling
13 three or more times in the previous week (N=14,980). These trips include bicycling for any
14 purpose. In addition to representing the likelihood of bicycling, these two outcome variables
15 represent different levels of bicycling frequency and therefore potentially different populations
16 of bicyclists.

17 Table 1 presents a descriptive summary of the variables included in the regression
18 analysis. In addition to social and demographic factors, we hypothesized that urban-rural status
19 predicts bicycling frequency and propensity. Therefore, we included information about the
20 urban-rural status of each respondent based on their residential census tract.

22 **Operational Definitions of RSLD Places**

23 Because categories such as “urban” and “rural” do not have an intrinsic meaning, they must be
24 translated into operational definitions for analysis (21-23). We used the following operational
25 definitions of urban-rural continua to represent urban-rural status.

27 *Rural-Urban Commuting Areas*

28
29 Rural-Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) definitions reflect the intensity of commute flows
30 between places and therefore this definition emphasizes economic relationships between places
31 rather than urban form (24). For instance, a place may be located in an agricultural environment
32 outside of a large metropolitan area, but if a significant proportion of its population commutes to
33 work inside the metropolitan area, this place is considered more urban than rural.

34 The RUCA system includes 33 categories that can be aggregated into specialized urban-
35 rural continua. We used the ten primary RUCA categories and did not aggregate them into a
36 special definition. These ten categories are:

- 37 • Level 1: Metropolitan area core with primary commuting within an Urbanized Area
38 (UA);
- 39 • Level 2: Metropolitan area high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to UA;
- 40 • Level 3: Metropolitan area low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a UA;
- 41 • Level 4: Micropolitan area core, primary flow within an Urban Cluster (UC) of 10,000 to
42 49,999;
- 43 • Level 5: Micropolitan high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a large UC;

- 1 • Level 6: Micropolitan low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a large UC;
- 2 • Level 7: Small town core, primary flow within a UC of 2,500 to through 9,999;
- 3 • Level 8: Small town high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a small UC;
- 4 • Level 9: Small town low commuting, primary flow 10% to 29% to a small UC; and
- 5 • Level 10: Rural areas, primary flow to a tract outside a UA or UC (including self).

6 We consider the Level 1 RUCA to be the “urban” category and all other levels to be
7 RSLD categories.

8 9 *Population Density Categories*

10
11 The second urban-rural continuum definition we applied is based on population density.
12 Population density represents the built environment characteristics relevant to bicycling
13 behavior. For instance, towns and villages in rural areas may have relatively high population
14 densities and an urban form that closely resembles older cities. Similarly, places considered part
15 of Urbanized Areas according to the Census definition may have rural population densities and
16 urban form. These are differences that matter for the propensity to bicycle, particularly for
17 transportation. We used the 2010 US Census to calculate population density for each Census
18 tract based on total population and land area.

19 We determined the cutoff points for each level in this continuum using the distribution of
20 population densities for the state of Colorado as a reference as well as research about suburban
21 sprawl (25). The categories include: rural (<200 persons per square mile), low-density suburban
22 (200-1,200 persons per square mile), suburban (1,200-2,400 persons per square mile), urban
23 (2,400-12,500 persons per square mile), and high-density urban ($\geq 12,500$ persons per square
24 mile). For instance, urban places in Colorado are generally in the “urban” category, whereas
25 cities such as Boston, Chicago, New York, and San Francisco tend to be “high-density urban”
26 because they include more Census tracts with population densities greater than 12,500 persons
27 per square mile. We consider the “rural,” “low-density suburban,” and “suburban” categories to
28 be RSLD and the “urban” and “high-density urban” to be the urban categories.

29 30 *Counties with Recreation-focused Economies and Retirement Communities*

31
32 We hypothesized that counties with recreation-focused economies and large retirement
33 communities could have a unique influence on bicycling behavior. Beale and Johnson developed
34 a methodology to identify “recreational counties” in nonmetropolitan areas in order to develop
35 research and policy to address the widespread population increases in these amenity-rich
36 locations (26). The definition of recreational counties accounts for phenomena such as second
37 homes and high levels of recreation-focused employment and income (27). Similarly, the
38 category “retirement counties” have significant populations of retired persons and associated
39 housing and services.

TABLE 1 Summary of Self-Reported Bicycling Frequency by Individual, Household, and Area Characteristics, 2009 National Household Travel Survey

Variable	Category	NHTS: Self-reported bicycling activity in the past week (%)			
		N	Zero trips	One or two trips	Three or more trips
Sex					
	Male	133,211	86.2	6.8	7.0
	Female	152,423	91.8	4.5	3.7
Age					
	< 18	43,103	63.1	16.0	21.0
	18 or older	242,531	93.8	3.7	2.5
Household income					
	Under 100k	218,335	90.4	4.8	4.9
	Over 100k	67,299	85.4	8.2	6.4
Race of household respondent					
	White	245,238	89.1	5.6	5.3
	African American, Black	16,395	91.1	4.2	4.7
	Asian only	6,673	89.1	6.5	4.4
	American Indian, Alaskan Native	2,236	90.3	4.5	5.1
	Native Hawaiian, other Pacific	884	87.3	7.5	5.2
	Multiracial	1,879	87.9	5.5	6.6
	Hispanic	9,125	87.3	6.6	6.1
	Other	3,204	89.8	5.4	4.8
Children in household (among respondents age 18+)					
	No	183,078	89.0	5.4	5.8
	Yes	59,453	91.0	6.2	3.0
Population density					
	High-density urban (>12,500)	77,055	91.6	4.2	4.2
	Urban (2400-12,500)	71,699	89.1	5.8	5.1
	Suburban (1200-2400)	40,926	88.7	5.9	5.4
	Low density suburban (200-1200)	87,770	88.6	5.9	5.4
	Rural (<200/mi ²)	8,184	89.8	4.9	5.3
RUCA					
	Most urban 1	188,200	88.7	6.0	5.3
	Level 2	40,629	89.2	5.3	5.5
	Level 3	2,661	89.6	5.0	5.3
	Level 4	17,531	89.7	5.0	5.3
	Level 5	7,776	90.4	4.4	5.2
	Level 6	1,623	92.0	3.0	5.0
	Level 7	9,821	91.7	4.0	4.3
	Level 8	2,512	92.5	3.3	4.2
	Level 9	1,586	91.1	4.0	4.9
	Most rural	13,295	91.0	4.1	4.9
Recreation county					
	No	275,032	89.2	5.5	5.2
	Yes	10,602	88.0	6.0	6.0
Retirement county					
	No	231,281	89.6	5.4	5.0
	Yes	54,353	87.6	6.2	6.2

Notes: Categories defined as rural (<200 persons per square mile), low-density suburban (200-1,200 persons per square mile), suburban (1,200-2,400 persons per square mile), urban (2,400-12,500 persons per square mile), and high-density urban (≥12,500 persons per square mile). Sources: Ewing et al. 2003; U.S. Census, 2016.

Rural-Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) categories represent commute flows between population centers. Level 1: Metropolitan area core with primary commuting within an Urbanized Area (UA); Level 2: Metropolitan area high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to UA; Level 3: Metropolitan area low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a UA; Level 4: Micropolitan area core, primary flow within an Urban Cluster (UC) of 10,000 to 49,999; Level 5: Micropolitan high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a large UC; Level 6: Micropolitan low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a large UC; Level 7: Small town core, primary flow within a UC of 2,500 to through 9,999; Level 8: Small town high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a small UC; Level 9: Small town low commuting, primary flow 10% to 29% to a small UC; Level 10: Rural areas, primary flow to a tract outside a UA or UC (including self). Sources: Rural Health Research Center, 2016. U.S. Census, 2016.

1 Analytical Approach

2 We used binary logistic regression to estimate the likelihood of a respondent bicycling in the
 3 previous week, using two different dependent variables representing different frequencies of
 4 bicycling (i.e., one or two times, three times or more). The binary logistic regression model
 5 explains the relationship between the covariates and the binary outcome variable. The parameter
 6 coefficients in a logit regression model are expressed as log odds, which can be transformed into
 7 odds ratios. Odds ratios are defined as the probability that an event occurs divided by the
 8 probability that it does not occur. For example, a 0.5 probability of an event occurring has an
 9 odds ratio of 1.0. In the context of multivariate regression, the odds ratio represents the
 10 association of a covariate (x) on the outcome variable (Y) holding all other covariates constant.

11
 12 The model form is given by the following equation,

$$14 \Pr(Y) = \frac{e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}}{1 + e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_n x_n)}}$$

15
 16 where,

17
 18 Y = survey respondent reported bicycling at the given level

19
 20 x = covariate (reported in tables below)

21
 22 β_0 = intercept parameter

23
 24 β = parameter estimate

25
 26 We specified the model using a purposeful approach based on theoretical relationships,
 27 prior empirical research, bivariate relationships between the dependent variables and potential
 28 covariates, and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as a measure of model fit (28). We
 29 included interaction terms to examine the differential effects of age, gender, and income by
 30 urban-rural status. We also tested ordinal logistic models with a dependent variable representing
 31 the three different bicycling frequencies (i.e., zero times, one or two times, three or more times).
 32 The results were similar to those of the binary logistic models. We present only the results of the
 33 binary logistic models because of their relative clarity.

34 35 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

36 Table 1 presents a descriptive summary of the frequency of bicycling by personal, household,
 37 and area-level factors. The majority of men and women in the sample reported not making any
 38 trips by bicycle in the previous week (86% and 92%, respectively). The proportion of
 39 respondents who reported bicycling one or two times in the previous week was 7% among men
 40 and 5% among women, and a similar proportion reported bicycling three or more times in the
 41 previous week (7% and 4%, respectively). People under age 18 reported the highest levels of

1 bicycling activity; 16% bicycled one or two times in the previous week, and 21% reported
2 bicycling at least three times.

3 Bicycling frequency estimates varied depending on which urban-rural continuum
4 definition was used. Using the population density definition, urban, suburban and low-density
5 suburban places had the highest proportion of respondents reporting bicycling one or two times
6 in the previous week (all about 6%), and high-density urban places had the lowest proportion
7 (4%). Pearson chi-square tests confirm that these differences are statistically significant
8 ($p < .0001$). However, the Mantel-Haenszel test rejected a linear relationship between bicycling
9 frequency and urban-rural status, as measured by population density category ($p = 0.263$).
10 Therefore, differences in these proportions should be interpreted cautiously. Descriptive results
11 for bicycling three or more times in the previous week were similar, and both chi-square test
12 statistics were significant for this variable.

13 The RUCA definition produced the opposite gradient. When places were stratified by
14 RUCA, the most urban places (Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) had the highest proportion of bicycling one
15 or two times in the previous week (between 5% and 6%). Both chi-square test statistics were
16 significant for the RUCA definition ($p < .0001$). Results for bicycling three or more times in the
17 previous week were similar.

18 The differences between the two definitions of urban-rural continua may arise because
19 the most urban RUCA (Level 1) includes a wide range of population densities. Places with very
20 high population density, and that have relatively lower levels of bicycling, may be too few to
21 lower the proportion estimated for RUCA Level 1.

22

23 **Model Results**

24 Tables 2 and 3 present adjusted odds ratios from the regression analyses. These figures control
25 for individual, household, and area-level variables as well as the interaction effects of age,
26 gender, and income by urban-rural status. The interaction effects for race and ethnicity were not
27 significant and were not included in the model.

28

29 *Urban-Rural Status*

30

31 The model results suggest that bicycling is primarily—but not exclusively—an urban activity,
32 which is consistent with the findings of Loh et al. (9). Residents of certain types of RSLD places
33 were as likely to bicycle as their urban counterparts. This pattern was true for different bicycling
34 frequencies and different definitions of urban-rural continua. Moreover, according to the
35 population density definition, residents of the highest-density urban places were less likely to
36 bicycle one or two times in the previous week compared to residents living in the urban category
37 [odds ratio (OR)=0.69 (0.55, 0.85)].

38 For the RUCA definition, respondents who reside outside of the most urban category had
39 lower odds of bicycling one or two times the past week than their urban counterparts, all else
40 equal. However, not all of these differences were significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Levels 3 and 9
41 were statistically equivalent to the most urban level [OR=1.00 (0.74, 1.37) and OR=0.75 (0.48,
42 1.17), respectively]. These categories represent metropolitan areas with low commuting to an
43 Urbanized Area and small towns with low commuting to Urban Clusters, respectively. The

1 results were similar for bicycling three days or more, but the patterns were slightly different. For
 2 more frequent bicycling, micropolitan areas with various degrees of commuting (Levels 4, 5, 6,
 3 and 9) were statistically equivalent to the most urban levels [OR=0.97 (0.84, 1.12), OR=0.87
 4 (0.70, 1.08), OR=0.82 (0.50, 1.35), and OR=0.84 (0.53, 1.35), respectively].
 5

6 **TABLE 2 Logistic Regression Models for Bicycling Frequency by Rural-Urban Commuting Area, 2009**
 7 **National Household Travel Survey**

Variable	Category	Bicycling 1-2 times per week vs. 0 times			Bicycling 3 times per week or more vs. 0-2 times per week		
		Odds ratio	95% confidence interval	Probability	Odds ratio	95% confidence interval	Probability
Sex (ref=Female)	Male	1.62	(1.56, 1.69)	***	1.96	(1.86, 2.04)	***
Age (ref=18+)	Under eighteen	7.63	(7.30, 7.99)	***	9.73	(9.29, 10.20)	***
Race/ethnicity (ref=White)	African-American/Black	0.72	(0.66, 0.78)	***	0.84	(0.77, 0.91)	***
	Asian	0.82	(0.74, 0.91)	***	0.65	(0.58, 0.74)	***
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.73	(0.60, 0.90)	**	0.86	(0.70, 1.04)	
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	0.97	(0.74, 1.26)		0.71	(0.52, 0.96)	*
	Multiracial	0.88	(0.72, 1.08)		1.09	(0.90, 1.33)	
	Hispanic	0.84	(0.77, 0.92)	***	0.78	(0.71, 0.86)	***
	Other	0.83	(0.70, 0.97)	*	0.78	(0.66, 0.92)	**
Children in hh (ref=No)	Yes	2.15	(2.06, 2.24)	***	1.33	(1.26, 1.41)	***
Hh income >\$100,000 (ref=No)	Yes	1.42	(1.36, 1.48)	***	1.07	(1.02, 1.12)	**
RUCA categories (ref=Most urban level 1)	Level 2	0.86	(0.79, 0.94)	***	0.81	(0.73, 0.90)	***
	Level 3	1.00	(0.74, 1.37)		0.57	(0.38, 0.87)	**
	Level 4	0.86	(0.75, 0.98)	*	0.97	(0.84, 1.12)	
	Level 5	0.80	(0.66, 0.98)	*	0.87	(0.70, 1.08)	
	Level 6	0.55	(0.33, 0.92)	*	0.82	(0.50, 1.35)	
	Level 7	0.71	(0.59, 0.85)	***	0.68	(0.55, 0.84)	**
	Level 8	0.62	(0.42, 0.91)	*	0.55	(0.35, 0.87)	**
	Level 9	0.75	(0.48, 1.17)		0.84	(0.53, 1.35)	
	Level 10	0.75	(0.64, 0.87)	***	0.74	(0.62, 0.89)	***
Recreation county (ref=no)	Yes	1.42	(1.29, 1.55)	***	1.29	(1.17, 1.42)	***
Retirement county (ref=no)	Yes	1.22	(1.17, 1.27)	***	1.33	(1.27, 1.38)	***
Age * RUCA (ref=Most urban level 1)	Level 2	1.17	(1.06, 1.29)	**	1.66	(1.50, 1.85)	***
	Level 3	1.32	(0.91, 1.91)		1.98	(1.34, 2.93)	**
	Level 4	1.11	(0.95, 1.29)		1.17	(1.01, 1.35)	*
	Level 5	1.08	(0.85, 1.37)		1.84	(1.48, 2.30)	***
	Level 6	1.56	(0.87, 2.81)		2.61	(1.53, 4.39)	**
	Level 7	1.14	(0.92, 1.42)		1.55	(1.26, 1.92)	***
	Level 8	1.55	(0.98, 2.44)		2.80	(1.78, 4.41)	***
	Level 9	0.71	(0.40, 1.25)		1.84	(1.08, 2.93)	*
	Level 10	1.26	(1.05, 1.51)	*	1.71	(1.43, 2.04)	***
Male * RUCA (ref=Most urban level 1)	Level 2	0.89	(0.81, 0.98)	*	0.85	(0.77, 0.94)	**
	Level 3	0.72	(0.50, 1.03)		0.97	(0.66, 1.43)	
	Level 4	1.02	(0.88, 1.18)		1.00	(0.86, 1.16)	
	Level 5	0.84	(0.67, 1.06)		0.84	(0.68, 1.06)	
	Level 6	0.68	(0.38, 1.22)		0.57	(0.35, 0.92)	*
	Level 7	0.90	(0.73, 1.12)		0.95	(0.76, 1.18)	
	Level 8	0.67	(0.42, 1.05)		0.85	(0.55, 1.31)	
	Level 9	0.97	(0.58, 1.63)		0.66	(0.41, 1.08)	
	Level 10	0.79	(0.66, 0.95)	*	0.86	(0.72, 1.03)	
Hh income >\$100,000 * RUCA (ref=Most urban level 1)	Level 2	0.99	(0.89, 1.09)		0.85	(0.76, 0.96)	**
	Level 3	0.55	(0.34, 0.89)	*	1.55	(1.02, 2.36)	*
	Level 4	1.01	(0.84, 1.21)		0.97	(0.79, 1.18)	
	Level 5	1.27	(0.97, 1.68)		0.68	(0.49, 0.95)	*
	Level 6	0.82	(0.37, 1.82)		0.45	(0.18, 1.09)	
	Level 7	1.10	(0.83, 1.46)		1.04	(0.76, 1.42)	
	Level 8	1.04	(0.56, 1.93)		0.38	(0.16, 0.92)	*
	Level 9	1.38	(0.73, 2.59)		1.24	(0.65, 2.38)	
	Level 10	0.90	(0.70, 1.17)		0.98	(0.75, 1.26)	
<i>Summary statistics</i>							
N total		270,654			285,634		
N bike one time = 1 or bike three times = 1		15,884			14,980		
AIC - intercept only		120,898.10			117,484.21		
AIC - intercept and covariates		108,031.75			98,362.92		

Notes: Probability: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001.

Rural-Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) categories represent commute flows between population centers. Level 1: Metropolitan area core with primary commuting within an Urbanized Area (UA); Level 2: Metropolitan area high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a UA; Level 3: Metropolitan area low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a UA; Level 4: Micropolitan area core, primary flow within an Urban Cluster (UC) of 10,000 to 49,999; Level 5: Micropolitan high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a large UC; Level 6: Micropolitan low commuting, primary flow 10% to 30% to a large UC; Level 7: Small town core, primary flow within a UC of 2,500 to through 9,999; Level 8: Small town high commuting, primary flow 30% or more to a small UC; Level 9: Small town low commuting, primary flow 10% to 29% to a small UC; Level 10: Rural areas, primary flow to a tract outside a UA or UC (including self). Source: Rural Health Research Center. 2016. <http://depts.washington.edu/uwruca/ruca-codes.php>. U.S. Department of Transportation. 2010. National Household Travel Survey.

1 Urban rural differences in bicycling were slightly attenuated for the population density
2 definition. Respondents from low-density suburban and suburban places were as likely as urban
3 residents to bike one or two times in the previous week, all else equal. In contrast, respondents in
4 the most rural category and the high-density urban category were less likely than others to
5 bicycle one or two times in the previous week. Respondents from rural and low-density places
6 were also less likely to report bicycling three or more times in the previous week compared to
7 their urban counterparts [OR=0.80 (0.73, 0.88) and OR=0.90 (0.82, 0.99), respectively].

8 For both dependent variables, and for both the population density and RUCA models,
9 respondents residing in recreation counties and retirement counties were more likely than others
10 to report bicycling in the previous week. The odds ratios across the different models and
11 definitions of urban-rural continua were in the range of 1.21 to 1.40. This suggests that niche
12 environments combining social, cultural, and built environment factors may attract bicyclists
13 through self-selection, and that these niche factors may be more useful for understanding
14 bicycling behavior than constructs representing urban-rural status.

15 *Personal and Household Factors*

16
17
18 Consistent with prior studies, men were more likely to bicycle than women, and more so when
19 considering bicycling three or more times per week. For the RUCA definition, the odds ratios
20 comparing male to female bicycling were OR=1.62 (1.56, 1.69) for bicycling one or two times in
21 the past week and OR=1.96 (1.86, 2.04) for bicycling three or more times in the past week. The
22 results were similar for the population density definition.

23 Children and youth under 18 years old had the highest odds of bicycling, with odds ratios
24 of seven or more. Household composition also mattered: adults ages 18 and older with children
25 in the household were more likely to bike than those in households without children, and the
26 effect was stronger for bicycling only one or two times in the past week. For the RUCA
27 definition the odds ratios were OR=2.15 (2.06, 2.24) for bicycling one or two times in the past
28 week and OR=1.33 (1.26, 1.41) for bicycling three or more times per week.

29 Household income greater than \$100,000 per year had a positive association with
30 bicycling and its effect was also stronger for bicycling only one or two times in the past week.
31 For the RUCA definition the odds ratios were OR=1.42 (1.36, 1.48) for bicycling one or two
32 times in the past week and OR=1.07 (1.02, 1.12) for bicycling three or more times in the past
33 week.

34 Respondents who identified as non-Hispanic white, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific,
35 multiracial, and other were statistically equally like to report bicycling one or two times in the
36 past week, whereas respondents of other races and ethnicities were less likely to bicycle.
37 Respondents who identified as non-Hispanic white, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and
38 multiracial were statistically equally likely to report bicycling three or more times in the past
39 week, whereas respondents of other races and ethnicities were less likely to bicycle.

TABLE 3 Logistic Regression Models for Bicycling Frequency by Population Density, 2009 National Household Travel Survey

Variable	Category	Bicycling 1-2 times per week vs. 0 times			Bicycling 3 times per week or more vs. 0-2 times per week		
		Odds ratio	95% confidence interval	Probability	Odds ratio	95% confidence interval	Probability
Sex (ref=Female)	Male	1.71	(1.61, 1.81)	***	2.18	(2.04, 2.33)	***
Age (ref=18+)	Under eighteen	7.04	(6.61, 7.51)	***	7.90	(7.40, 8.44)	***
Race/ethnicity (ref=White)	African-American/Black	0.73	(0.67, 0.79)	***	0.84	(0.78, 0.91)	***
	Asian	0.85	(0.76, 0.94)	**	0.66	(0.58, 0.74)	***
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.73	(0.59, 0.90)	**	0.86	(0.70, 1.05)	
	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	1.00	(0.77, 1.30)		0.73	(0.53, 0.99)	*
	Multiracial	0.90	(0.73, 1.10)		1.10	(0.90, 1.33)	
	Hispanic	0.89	(0.81, 0.97)	**	0.82	(0.74, 0.90)	***
	Other	0.86	(0.74, 1.01)		0.80	(0.67, 0.95)	**
Children in hh (ref=No)	Yes	2.16	(2.06, 2.25)	***	1.34	(1.26, 1.41)	***
Hh income >\$100,000 (ref=No)	Yes	1.52	(1.43, 1.61)	***	1.17	(1.09, 1.25)	***
Population density (ref=Urban)	Rural	0.86	(0.79, 0.93)	***	0.80	(0.73, 0.88)	***
	Low-density suburban	0.97	(0.89, 1.05)		0.90	(0.82, 0.99)	*
	Suburban	1.04	(0.95, 1.14)		0.99	(0.89, 1.10)	
	High-density urban	0.69	(0.55, 0.85)	***	0.99	(0.79, 1.25)	
Recreation county (ref=No)	Yes	1.30	(1.19, 1.42)	***	1.28	(1.17, 1.40)	***
Retirement county (ref=No)	Yes	1.21	(1.16, 1.26)	***	1.32	(1.27, 1.38)	***
Age * density level (ref=Urban)	Rural	1.28	(1.17, 1.40)	***	2.08	(1.89, 2.28)	***
	Low-density suburban	1.28	(1.17, 1.39)	***	1.73	(1.57, 1.90)	***
	Suburban	1.05	(0.94, 1.17)		1.37	(1.22, 1.53)	***
	High-density urban	0.81	(0.64, 1.03)		0.50	(0.40, 0.64)	***
Male * density level (ref=Urban)	Rural	0.82	(0.75, 0.90)	***	0.75	(0.68, 0.83)	***
	Low-density suburban	0.88	(0.81, 0.96)	**	0.79	(0.72, 0.87)	***
	Suburban	0.93	(0.84, 1.04)		0.88	(0.79, 0.99)	*
	High-density urban	1.32	(1.04, 1.67)		1.37	(1.07, 1.76)	*
Hh income >\$100,000 * density level (ref=Urban)	Rural	0.96	(0.87, 1.06)		0.91	(0.82, 1.01)	
	Low-density suburban	0.91	(0.87, 1.06)		0.79	(0.71, 0.87)	***
	Suburban	0.89	(0.80, 0.99)	*	0.85	(0.75, 0.96)	***
	High-density urban	0.89	(0.69, 1.17)		0.82	(0.61, 1.09)	
<i>Summary statistics</i>							
N total		270,654			285,634		
N bike one/two times = 1 or bike three times = 1		15,884			14,980		
AIC - intercept only		120,898.10			117,484.21		
AIC - intercept and covariates		108,034.40			98,147.92		

Notes: Probability: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001.

Population density categories defined as rural (<200 persons per square mile), low-density suburban (200-1,200 persons per square mile), suburban (1,200-2,400 persons per square mile), urban (2,400-12,500 persons per square mile), and high-density urban (≥12,500 persons per square mile). Sources: Ewing et al. 2003; U.S. Census, 2016; U.S. Department of Transportation

Differential Effects of Age, Gender, and Income by Urban-Rural Status

This analysis extends prior understanding of bicycling in RSLD places by examining the interaction effects of age, gender, and income by urban-rural status. Compared to urban bicyclists, RSLD bicyclists are more likely to be women and youth, which are two groups at the center of efforts to expand the reach of bicycling beyond adult men.

Youth are more likely to bicycle in RSLD environments. Although bicycling frequency is highest in urban places according to both the RUCA and population density definitions of urban-rural status, the relationship between bicycling and urbanicity reversed when age (under 18 years old) was considered as an interaction term.

For the population density definition, younger people were more likely than adults to report bicycling one or two times in the previous week when they lived in rural or low-density suburban places [OR=1.28 (1.17, 1.40) and OR=1.28 (1.17, 1.39), respectively]. The differential effects of urban-rural status were stronger for bicycling three or more times in the previous week.

1 Youth in rural places had twice the odds of bicycling as adults in urban places [OR=2.08 (1.89,
2 2.28)]. In addition, youth who live in the high-density urban category were less likely to bicycle
3 three or more times per week compared to adults in the urban category [OR=0.50 (0.40, 0.64).

4 The results were mixed for the RUCA definition: for each level of the urban-rural
5 continuum, youth were increasingly likely to bicycle in more rural places when considering
6 bicycling three or more times per week, but this relationship was true for only levels 2 and 10
7 when considering bicycling one or two times in the previous week.

8 **Rural and suburban environments may be more amenable for women's bicycling.**

9 Men were more likely than women to report bicycling three times per week or more in the high-
10 density urban places, but this outcome was less likely at every other level of the urban-rural
11 continuum. The results were similar for bicycling one or two times per week, but the effect was
12 significant only for rural and low-density suburban places. For both outcome variables, male
13 respondents from high-density urban area were more likely to bike compared to the female
14 respondents from urban area [OR=1.32 (1.04, 1.67), OR=1.37 (1.07, 1.76), respectively]. These
15 results were weaker for the RUCA definition.

16 **The interaction effects were mixed with respect to income.** The interaction term with
17 household income did not reach statistical significance for most categories of urban-rural status.
18 Certain RSLD environments appeared to support bicycling among households with incomes
19 lower than \$100,000 per year, but the effect depended on the definition of the urban-rural
20 continuum.

21
22 **CONCLUSIONS**

23 In this study we tested the hypothesis that bicycling is primarily an urban activity, and found that
24 it is primarily, but not exclusively urban. In certain types of places, RSLD residents are as likely
25 to bicycle as their urban counterparts. The most important finding, however, is that the
26 population characteristics of urban and RSLD bicyclists are different.

27 First, young people had lower odds of bicycling in high-density urban places compared to
28 other environments. This means that a paradigm of bikeable communities that replicates patterns
29 urban bicycling that work well for adults may exclude youth and children. For example, a policy
30 and programming emphasis that encourages employers to support bicycling for commuting (e.g.,
31 bike to work day) would not be widely relevant to people who do not have an employer.
32 However, this is not to say that youth and children would not benefit from utilitarian bicycling
33 options. Youth and children do not drive cars and therefore their relatively limited mobility may
34 be expanded by bicycling. Useful models for youth-oriented bicycle mobility could emerge
35 from RSLD settings.

36 Second, based on a population density definition of RSLD places, women had lower odds
37 of bicycling in high-density urban places compared to those with relatively lower population
38 densities. Despite efforts from mainstream bicycle advocacy groups to increase women's
39 cycling, an underlying urban bicycling paradigm may also be a mismatch holding back programs
40 to create gender parity in bicycling. The reasons for this difference are unknown but may include
41 different levels of comfort bicycling with heavy traffic, or perhaps different underlying activity
42 patterns across settings.

1 We also found that for both dependent variables, and for both the population density and
2 RUCAs models, respondents residing in recreation counties and retirement counties had higher
3 odds of reporting bicycling in the previous week. This suggests that niche environments
4 combining social, cultural, and built environment factors may be more relevant to bicycling than
5 constructs representing urban-rural status. In addition to offering amenities that support
6 bicycling, these places may encourage bicycling for economic reasons. Research on rural
7 economic development has found that economic growth, population growth, and land
8 development in recreational places is accompanied with higher cost of living, particularly
9 housing costs (29). Therefore, if bicycling is a lower-cost mode of transportation in expensive
10 recreational settings, particularly rural recreational settings, bicycling may be used to offset
11 higher housing costs. This example suggests a need to better understand the nature of bicycling
12 in RSLD places. If bicycling for transportation purposes is more common among lower-socio
13 economic groups, then considering the transportation/commute needs of RSLD residents is an
14 important topic for future research and policy with respect to promoting bicycling in RSLD
15 places.

16 Other results from this study are consistent with prior research, particularly the
17 propensity to bicycle among groups with higher socio-economic status. For example,
18 respondents with household incomes above \$100,000 per year had higher odds of bicycling
19 compared to those with incomes below \$100,000. Additionally, respondents who identify as
20 white had higher odds of bicycling compared to most other racial/ethnic groups. These findings
21 may vary by trip purpose, which we did not control for, and which is a limitation of this study. A
22 further limitation is the potential undercoverage of non-white travelers in the NHTS data, as well
23 as other groups that may be hard to reach given the survey's methods. These respondents who
24 are difficult to reach may include bicyclists across urban and RSLD places and the potential bias
25 due to their missing data is unknown. Data collection and research designs that capture
26 information about hard-to-reach populations are next steps for understanding the full reach of
27 bicycling across places and populations.

28 Future research on bicycling in RSLD places should also investigate whether the cultural
29 meaning of bicycling differs between urban and RSLD places in ways that important for how
30 communities approach bicycle policy, planning, and design. For example, an urban model of
31 bicycling that emphasizes an urban built environment and a car-free lifestyle may conflict with a
32 smaller community's values, lifestyles, and physical environments. Specialized data collection
33 and analysis comparing RSLD and urban places with respect to their motivation for bicycling
34 and the strategies that they use to create a bikeable community are important next steps.

35

36 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

37

38 This research received support from the University of Colorado Denver.

39

40 **REFERENCES**

41

- 1 1. Gray, D., J. Farrington, and A. Kagermeier. Geographies of Rural Transport, in *Transport*
2 *Geographies: Mobilities, Flows and Spaces*, R. Knowles, J. Shaw, and I. Docherty, eds.
3 Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2008.
- 4 2. Nutley, S.D. Rural transport problems and non-car populations in the USA: A UK
5 perspective. *Journal of Transport Geography*. 1996;4(2):93-106.
- 6 3. Graham, J., J. Irving, X. Tang, S. Sellers, J. Crisp, D. Horwitz, L. Muehlenbachs, A.
7 Krupnick, D. Carey. Increased traffic accident rates associated with shale gas drilling in
8 Pennsylvania. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 2015;74:203-9.
- 9 4. Huntington, G., K. Ksaibati. Method for Assessing Heavy Traffic Impacts on Gravel Roads
10 Serving Oil-and Gas-Drilling Operations. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the*
11 *Transportation Research Board*. 2009, (2101):17-24.
- 12 5. Pucher J., J.L. Renne. Rural mobility and mode choice: Evidence from the 2001 National
13 Household Travel Survey. *Transportation*. 2005;32(2):165-86.
- 14 6. Rosenbloom, S. Facing societal challenges: the need for new paradigms in rural transit
15 service. *Journal of Public Transportation*. 2003;6(1):1.
- 16 7. Handy, S.L., Y. Xing, T.J. Buehler. Factors associated with bicycle ownership and use: a
17 study of six small US cities. *Transportation*. 2010;37(6):967-85.
- 18 8. Litt, J.S., C. McAndrews. Kaiser Permanente Walk and Wheel Initiative: Final Evaluation
19 Report. 2016. University of Colorado
- 20 9. Loh, T.H., J. Walljasper, D. Sonenklar, K. Mills, D. Levinger. Active Transportation Beyond
21 Urban Centers: Walking and Bicycling in Small Towns and Rural America. 2012. Rails to
22 Trails Conservancy. Washington, D.C.
- 23 10. Pucher, J, R. Buehler, D. Merom, A. Bauman. Walking and cycling in the United States,
24 2001–2009: evidence from the National Household Travel Surveys. *American Journal of*
25 *Public Health*. 2011; 101(S1):S310-7.
- 26 11. Noland, R.B., D. Deka, R. Walia. A statewide analysis of bicycling in New Jersey.
27 *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*. 2011;5(5):251-69.
- 28 12. Handy, S., B. Van Wee, M. Kroesen. Promoting cycling for transport: research needs and
29 challenges. *Transport Reviews*. 2014;34(1):4-24.
- 30 13. Umstattd, M.M., J.B. Moore, C. Abildso, M.B. Edwards, A. Gamble, M.L. Baskin. Rural
31 Active Living: A Call to Action. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2015.
- 32 14. Frost, S.S., R.T. Goins, R.H. Hunter, S.P. Hooker, L.L. Bryant, J. Kruger, D. Pluto. Effects
33 of the built environment on physical activity of adults living in rural settings. *American*
34 *Journal of Health Promotion*. 2010;24(4):267-83.
- 35 15. Martin, S.L., G.J. Kirkner, K. Mayo, C.E. Matthews, J.L. Durstine, J.R. Hebert. Urban, rural,
36 and regional variations in physical activity. *Journal of Rural Health*. 2005;47(26.4):46-.
- 37 16. Reis, J.P., H.R. Bowles, B.E. Ainsworth, K.D. Dubose, S. Smith, J.N. Laditka.
38 Nonoccupational physical activity by degree of urbanization and US geographic region.
39 *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*. 2004;36(12):2093-8.
- 40 17. Parks, S.E., R.A. Housemann, R.C. Brownson. Differential correlates of physical activity in
41 urban and rural adults of various socioeconomic backgrounds in the United States. *Journal of*
42 *Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2003;57(1):29-35.

- 1 18. Ewing, R., G. Meakins, S. Hamidi, A.C. Nelson. Relationship between urban sprawl and
2 physical activity, obesity, and morbidity—Update and refinement. *Health & Place*.
3 2014;26:118-26.
- 4 19. ChangeLab Solutions. On the Move Safe Routes to School Policies in Rural School Districts.
5 2014. [http://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/SRTS-Policies-
7 Rural_School_Districts-FINAL_20140611.pdf](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/SRTS-Policies-
6 Rural_School_Districts-FINAL_20140611.pdf).
- 8 20. Santos, A., N. McGuckin, H.Y. Nakamoto, D. Gray, S. Liss. Summary of travel trends: 2009
9 National Household Travel Survey. U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA-PL-11-022.
- 10 21. Hartley, D. Rural health disparities, population health, and rural culture. *American Journal of
11 Public Health*. 2004;94(10):1675-8.
- 12 22. Hart, L.G., E.H. Larson, D.M. Lishner. Rural definitions for health policy and research.
13 *American Journal of Public Health*. 2005;95(7):1149-55.
- 14 23. Hall, S.A., J.S. Kaufman, T.C. Ricketts. Defining urban and rural areas in US epidemiologic
15 studies. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2006;83(2):162-75.
- 16 24. WWAMI RUCA Rural Health Research Center. UW RHRC Rural Urban Commuting Area
17 Codes. Website visited 12 June 2016. [washington.edu/uwruca/index.php](http://www.washington.edu/uwruca/index.php).
- 18 25. Ewing, R., R.A. Schieber, C.V. Zegeer. Urban sprawl as a risk factor in motor vehicle
19 occupant and pedestrian fatalities. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2003;93(9):1541-5.
- 20 26. Beale, C.L., K.M. Johnson. The identification of recreational counties in nonmetropolitan
21 areas of the USA. *Population Research and Policy Review*. 1998;17(1):37-53.
- 22 27. U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA Economic Research Service-County Typology
23 Codes. 2016. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/county-typology-codes.aspx>.
- 24 28. Bursac, Z., C.H. Gauss, D.K. Williams, D.W. Hosmer. Purposeful selection of variables in
25 logistic regression. *Source Code for Biology and Medicine*. 2008;3(1):1.
- 26 29. Hunter, L.M., J.D. Boardman, J.M. Onge. The Association Between Natural Amenities,
27 Rural Population Growth, and Long-Term Residents' Economic Well-Being. *Rural
Sociology*. 2005;70(4):452-69.