Appendix A. Sensitivity test of multilevel models.
To explore the neighborhood scale influence on active travel, while controlling for the influence of individual level factors, we adopted the multilevel modeling techiques. A multilevel modeling approach recoginizes hiearchical clusters and identify and differeiates between-cluster heterogeneity (Habib and Miller, 2008). In addition, a mixed-effects logistic regression model allows for many levels of nested clusters of both fixed and random effects (Stata, 2015). The model also performs optimization using the original metric of variance components (Stata, 2015). A two-level and a three-level model were applied. The models are represented as following:

$$
\begin{align*}
& Y i j=\beta_{0 j}+\beta_{l} X_{i j}+\varepsilon_{i j}  \tag{1}\\
& \beta_{i j}=\beta_{0}+\beta_{2} Z_{j}+\mu_{0_{j}} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $Y i j$ is active transport, $\beta_{0 j}$ and $\beta_{l}$ are parameters, $\varepsilon_{i j}$ is the error term, and $X_{i j}$ is the independent variables; $\beta 0, \beta 1$, and $\beta 2$ are the fixed components that represent fixed intercept and parameters for independent variables, and $\mu_{0_{j}}$ is the random effects.

In the multilevel models, we assumed that people from each neigborhood were nested in one of the four neighborhood types. The dependent variable was active travel. In the two-level model, we ignored the neighborhood types and fit a a two-level model. In the three-level model, we incorporated invididual neighborhoods nested within each neighborhood types as an additional level. Both the two-level and three-level models showed similar results as the logistic regression models. Travel time, age, carownership, and desity were significant for both work trips and non-worktrips. Gender, education, and household size were only significant for work trips and employment and income were only significant for non-work trips. A likelihood-ratio
test comparing to the logistic regression model was provided and was not significant for nonwork trips $($ Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.469)$ but significant for work trips at the $1 \%$ level $($ Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.001$ ). Compared to Model 3, gender became significant, females had a higher chance to choose active travel than male; FAR became significant at the $5 \%$ level, higher FAR indicated less chance of choosing active travel; Dissimilarity, intersection, riverfront location, and consruction were not significant anymore.

Table A-1. Results of three-level model for both work and non-work trips.

|  | Odds Ratio | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathbf{P}>\|\mathbf{z}\|$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work trips ( $\mathrm{n}=1,182$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel time | 0.949 | -0.053 | 0.006 | -8.85 | 0.000 | *** |
| Number of mode options | 1.188 | 0.173 | 0.144 | 1.43 | 0.154 |  |
| Female | 1.500 | 0.405 | 0.222 | 2.73 | 0.006 | ** |
| Age | 1.040 | 0.040 | 0.009 | 4.81 | 0.000 | *** |
| Education | 0.927 | -0.076 | 0.021 | -3.35 | 0.001 | ** |
| Employment | 2.234 | 0.804 | 1.648 | 1.09 | 0.276 |  |
| Household size | 1.356 | 0.304 | 0.086 | 4.82 | 0.000 | *** |
| Car ownership | 0.266 | -1.323 | 0.043 | -8.13 | 0.000 | *** |
| Income | 1.005 | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.66 | 0.508 |  |
| FAR | 0.863 | -0.147 | 0.063 | -2.00 | 0.045 | * |
| Dissimilarity | 18.592 | 2.923 | 34.534 | 1.57 | 0.116 |  |
| Intersection | 1.009 | 0.009 | 0.024 | 0.36 | 0.715 |  |
| Bike lane | 1.329 | 0.285 | 0.403 | 0.94 | 0.348 |  |
| Riverfront | 0.930 | -0.072 | 0.274 | -0.25 | 0.806 |  |
| Construction | 0.779 | -0.250 | 0.236 | -0.83 | 0.409 |  |
| constant | 0.785 | -0.243 | 0.854 | -0.22 | 0.824 |  |
| Neighborhood type |  | 0.000 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Neighborhood |  | 0.393 | 0.142 |  |  |  |
| Non-Work ( $\mathrm{n}=1,215$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel time | 0.948 | -0.053 | 0.007 | -7.02 | 0.000 | *** |
| Number of mode options | 0.921 | -0.082 | 0.136 | -0.56 | 0.577 |  |
| Female | 1.374 | 0.318 | 0.262 | 1.67 | 0.095 |  |
| Age | 1.062 | 0.061 | 0.008 | 7.63 | 0.000 | *** |
| Education | 0.961 | -0.040 | 0.027 | -1.42 | 0.155 |  |
| Employment | 0.205 | -1.583 | 0.042 | -7.71 | 0.000 | *** |
| Household size | 0.897 | -0.109 | 0.074 | -1.31 | 0.190 |  |
| Car ownership | 0.500 | -0.694 | 0.099 | -3.49 | 0.000 | *** |
| Income | 1.024 | 0.024 | 0.006 | 3.87 | 0.000 | *** |
| FAR | 0.827 | -0.190 | 0.048 | -3.26 | 0.001 | ** |
| Dissimilarity | 1.363 | 0.310 | 1.879 | 0.22 | 0.822 |  |


|  | Odds Ratio | Coef. | Std. Err. | $\mathbf{z}$ | $\mathbf{P}>\|\mathbf{z}\|$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection | 1.033 | 0.032 | 0.018 | 1.86 | 0.063 |
| Bike lane | 1.101 | 0.096 | 0.264 | 0.40 | 0.687 |
| Riverfront | 1.136 | 0.128 | 0.278 | 0.52 | 0.603 |
| Construction | 0.700 | -0.357 | 0.166 | -1.50 | 0.133 |
| constant | 4.259 | 1.449 | 3.537 | 1.74 | 0.081 |
| Neighborhood type |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |
| Neighborhood |  | 0.007 | 0.090 |  |  |

