Impact evaluation of a public bicycle share program on cycling: A case example of BIXI in Montreal, Canada.

ABSRACT

OBJECTIVES: BIXI (BIcycle-taXI) is a public bicycle share program implemented in Montreal, Canada in 2009. BIXI increases accessibility to cycling by making available 5050 bicycles at 405 bicycle docking stations. This study examines associations between residential exposure to the BIXI public bicycle share program and likelihood of cycling (BIXI and non-BIXI) in Montreal over the first two years of implementation.

METHODS: Three population-based samples of adults participated in telephone surveys. Data collection occurred at the launch of the program (spring 2009), at the end of the first (fall 2009), and second (fall 2010) seasons of implementation. Difference in differences models assessed whether or not greater cycling was observed for those exposed to BIXI compared to those not exposed at each time point.

RESULTS: A greater likelihood of cycling was observed for those exposed to the public bicycle share program after the second season of implementation (OR=2.86, 95% CI: 1.85, 4.42) while controlling for weather, built environment, and individual variables.

CONCLUSIONS: The implementation of a public bicycle share program can lead to greater likelihood of cycling among persons living in areas where bicycles are made available.

Key words: bicycling, transportation, intervention studies, urban health

The relationship between transportation and health is of growing interest in public health.[1, 2] Studies show associations between high levels of cycling for transportation or utilitarian cycling and reduced traffic congestion,[3] noise and air pollution,[4] and obesity as well as increases in physical activity.[5-7] Cycling contributes to overall physical activity which is associated with a number of health benefits including, reduced body mass index (BMI), waist circumference, and improved blood lipid profiles (i.e., total cholesterol, low density lipoprotein cholesterol, and triglycerides).[8-12] As well, modelling studies suggest that the health benefits of physical activity resulting from increased cycling would outweigh the risks of collisions and exposure to air pollution.[13, 14]

In North America, the potential of cycling as a means to augment population levels of physical activity is also evidenced, at least in part, by its low prevalence even in densely built urban areas. In Canada, the proportion of individuals who cycled to work was 0.6% in 2006 and in the United States the share of bicycle commuters was 0.55% in 2008.[15, 16] The current low prevalence and the positive health benefits of greater cycling explain why initiatives to promote cycling, particularly cycling for transportation, are now a major public health aim. To date, only a small number of built environment interventions to promote cycling have been evaluated.[17-23] These intervention studies have shown small but statistically significant associations between intervention implementation and self-reported cycling.[17-19] However, a variety of potentially effective built environment interventions have been implemented but not evaluated.

Public bicycle share programs (PBSP), widely implemented in Western European cities, increase population access to bicycles by making bicycles available at docking stations throughout an area within a city for a fee.[22, 24] For example, Montreal's BIXI (BIcycle-taXI) program, North America's largest in 2011, launched in May 2009 makes available 5050 bicycles at 405 docking stations within an area of ~46.5km^2, encompassing ~380,000 inhabitants. Bicycles are available for a check out fee of $5 for 24 hours, $48 for a month or $78 for the season. After paying the check out fee the first 30 minutes of usage is free. Users extending their usage beyond 30 minutes pay a usage fee of approximately $1.50 per 30 minutes. Two recent studies provide evidence that PBSPs have the potential to contribute to population levels of cycling and may, as a result, increase population levels of physical activity.[24] Approximately 8% of the population of Montreal had used BIXI at least once in the first year of implementation.[25] Cycling behavior prior to the implementation of the program and having a university education were positively correlated with likelihood of using the program at least once. A health impact assessment of the Bicing program in Barcelona showed that compared to car users, the annual change in mortality for the 181,982 Bicing users was an additional 0.03 deaths from road traffic incidents, 0.13 deaths from air pollution, and 12.46 deaths avoided as a result of physical activity. The estimated annual number of deaths avoided as a result of Bicing was 12.28.[14] However, despite initial evidence showing adoption and positive health benefits, to date, there is limited evidence that PBSPs actually increase overall cycling rates in cities where they are deployed.[22, 24]

The primary objective of the present study was to examine whether or not exposure to Montreal's BIXI program (a built environment intervention) would be associated with increases in total cycling, including cycling on BIXI and personal bicycles. We hypothesized that the implementation of BIXI would be associated with an increased likelihood of cycling for those exposed. Ancillary analyses examined whether increases in cycling are due to increases in utilitarian or recreational cycling. We hypothesized that utilitarian cycling would contribute more to the hypothesized increases in total cycling because BIXI is implemented in an urban area with high densities of destinations and targets utilitarian cycling (i.e., 30 minute free period). In sensitivity analyses, we examined whether associations for total cycling remained statistically for durations that could contribute to meeting public health recommendations for physical activity.

METHODS

Design

A repeated cross sectional design was used. Three population-based samples of adults participated in telephone surveys. Surveys were conducted at launch of BIXI (May 4th - June 10th 2009), at the end of the first season of implementation, season 1 (October 8th - December 12th 2009), and at the end of the second season of implementation, season 2 (November 8th - December 12th 2010). The implementation season of the program is from May through November. The sampling frame for each survey was individuals residing on the Island of Montreal with a landline telephone. Within contacted households the available individual to next celebrate a birthday and aged over 18 years was targeted to respond. To recruit sufficient numbers of respondents reporting cycling, the sampling frame was stratified according to the presence or absence of BIXI docking stations in the neighborhood of residence. In the first stratum, random digit dialing to landlines was used to contact those residing on the Island of Montreal. In the second stratum, oversampling was conducted by randomly selecting landlines with Montreal postal codes matched to neighborhoods where BIXI was available (see Figure 1 for details on random and oversampling and implementation timelines). Sampling fractions were 0.002 for all surveys and there was no overlap between surveys.

Procedures

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee of *Centre de Recherche du Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal*. Respondents were recruited via a polling firm who obtained verbal informed consent prior to participation. Respondents could respond to the survey in French or English. Researchers trained telephone interviewers and performed ongoing quality surveillance to ensure the survey was being conducted in accordance with researcher training.

Measures

The outcome variables were dichotomous indicators of cycling behavior, self-reported total, utilitarian, and recreational cycling for at least 10 minutes in the last week. Utilitarian cycling is defined as cycling performed as a means of achieving other ends, that is, not strictly for leisure or for cumulating health-enhancing physical activity.[22] Recreational cycling is performed for its own sake. To calculate the dichotomous variables respondents reported the number of days and minutes of total and recreational cycling in the past week using the long form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ).[26] The IPAQ data were dichotomized according to whether the respondent reporting any cycling for at least 10 minutes in the last week or reporting less than 10 minutes of cycling in the past week. For recreational cycling the IPAQ data were dichotomized as either respondents reporting recreational cycling for at least 10 minutes in the past week or reporting less than 10 minutes of recreational cycling in the past week. Utilitarian cycling was calculated by subtracting the number of minutes of recreational from the number of minutes total cycling. Utilitarian cycling was dichotomized according to whether the respondent reported utilitarian cycling for at least 10 minutes in the last week or reporting less than 10 minutes of utilitarian cycling in the past week. The IPAQ has shown good reliability and validity in past research.[26] Test retest using Spearman's correlation for all versions of the IPAQ was 0.81 (95% CI: 0.79; 0.82). Criterion validity between the long form of the IPAQ and accelerometer measured physical activity was fair to moderate (0.33, 95% CI: 0.26; 0.39). The IPAQ and the method for computing total, recreational, and utilitarian cycling have been used in past research.[26-28]

The primary independent variables were survey period (i.e., time) and exposure to BIXI docking stations. Survey period was operationalized as an ordinal variable with dummy variables distinguishing the pre-intervention, season 1, and season 2 surveys. Residential exposure to BIXI docking stations was operationalized using a dichotomous variable contrasting respondents with one or more BIXI docking stations within a 500m road network buffer of their home (i.e., exposed) from those with no BIXI docking stations available within a 500m buffer (i.e., not exposed). For a map of station locations visit https://montreal.bixi.com/. Road network buffers were calculated using geographic information systems. A 500m buffer was chosen because this represents an easily walkable distance.[25, 29] Some respondents completed the questionnaire before BIXI (n=1188) was actually launched or after it was removed for the season in season 1 (n=290) and season 2 (n=384). Those respondents were categorized as not exposed.

Covariates included mean weekly temperature, days of precipitation, density of destinations, street connectivity, and individual level socio-demographic characteristics. Mean temperature and number of days of precipitation (i.e., rain or snow) in the week preceding participant responses to the survey were calculated using data from Environment Canada.[30] Density of destinations was operationalized as a count of the number of services (i.e., parks, grocery stores, banks, pharmacies, and medical services) within a 500m road network buffer of respondent's homes. Street connectivity was operationalized as a count of the number of intersections within a 500m road network buffer of respondent's homes. Both measures have been used in past research as measures of urban form.[28, 31] Socio-demographic and health variables of age, sex, education, employment status, income, body mass index (BMI) and self-rated health were measured using questions from the 2006 Canadian Census[15] or with other standard questions.

Data analysis

Descriptive analysis of socio-demographic variables was conducted and compared with the 2006 Canadian census. To improve representativeness, the sample survey data were weighted for age and sex using 2006 Canadian census data.

Difference in differences (DD) estimation using logistic regression and generalized estimating equations (GEE) was used. DD estimation is commonly used for evaluating non-randomized interventions in economics.[32, 33] The analysis compares the difference in outcomes (i.e., cycling, utilitarian, and recreational cycling) before and after the intervention for the unexposed by the difference in outcomes before and after the intervention for the exposed using an interaction between time and exposure. The DD approach is appealing because of its simplicity and potential to address a number of threats to internal validity including common time trends in outcomes.[33]

Separate logistic regression and GEE models examined associations between time and residential exposure to BIXI docking stations with total, utilitarian, and recreational cycling while adjusting for covariates. Variables associated with the dependent variable at $p<0.1$ in bivariate analyses were entered into multivariate analysis. Multivariable analysis consisted of a five step logistic regression. In step 1, time was entered to assess changes across time in total, utilitarian, or recreational cycling (each outcome assessed in a separate analysis) on the Island of Montreal. In step 2, exposure to BIXI docking stations was entered to assess whether or not likelihood of cycling was higher in areas where bicycles were implemented. In step 3, the interaction terms between time and exposure to BIXI docking stations was entered. The main effect of time allowed for a test of the hypothesis that implementation of BIXI would result in greater likelihood of cycling on the entire Island of Montreal. The interaction terms test the hypothesis that the likelihood of cycling would be greater amongst respondents exposed to BIXI following its implementation in comparison to respondents not exposed following BIXI implementation. In step 4, mean weekly temperature and days of precipitation per week for the seven day period prior to participation were entered. Finally, in step 5, covariates (i.e., density of destinations, street connectivity, age, sex, education, employment status, and income, BMI and self-rated health) were entered into each model. Comparing the results between logistic regression and GEE (to control for neighborhood level characteristics) showed similar odds ratio and confidence intervals and did not change the interpretation of the results. Logistic regression results are presented.

Sensitivity analyses using logistic regression described above were conducted using 30 and 45 minutes per week of total cycling as outcomes to ensure the results were robust for durations of cycling that contribute to meeting public health recommendations for physical activity.

RESULTS

The pooled sample included 7012 respondents with 2001 (Mean age=49.4 years, 56.7% female), 2502 (Mean age=47.8 years, 61.8% female), and 2509 (Mean age=48.9 years, 59.0% female) adult respondents in each survey, respectively. Response rates for the samples were 36.9%, 34.6% and 35.7%, respectively. The analysis sample was 6418 (91.5% of the final sample of 7012). Excluded respondents numbering 594 (8.5%) had missing postal code data while 146 (25% of 594) had missing postal code and socio-demographic data. Table 1 presents the unweighted and weighted descriptive results for cycling, weather, and socio-demographic variables. Descriptive analyses for the three surveys showed that over time 17.8%, 10.9%, and 8.7% of respondents, respectively, had engaged in cycling (including cycling on BIXI or personal bicycles) at least once in the last seven days. Of those who reported cycling in the past week in season 1 and season 2, 26% (n=63) and 27% (n=56) used BIXI for at least one trip. For utilitarian cycling, proportions of BIXI use were 31% (n=44) for season 1 and 31% (n=46) for season 2. For recreational cycling proportions of BIXI use were 21% (n=25) and 18% (n=14), respectively for season 1 and season 2.

In bivariate analyses all variables except income were related to the dependent variables at $p<0.1$. Income was not included in subsequent models. Table 2 shows the results from weighted logistic regression analyses examining the relationship between the implementation of BIXI and total, utilitarian, and recreational cycling.

Total cycling

In step 1, the likelihood of cycling was lower at season 1 (OR = 0.56; 95% CI: 0.47, 0.67) and season 2 (OR = 0.40; 95% CI: 0.33, 0.49) compared to pre intervention. In step 2 exposure to BIXI docking stations (OR=2.62, 95% CI: 2.24, 3.07) was associated with greater likelihood of cycling compared to no exposure. In step 3, the addition of the interaction term (survey period*exposure to BIXI docking stations) showed that in addition to the main effects of time and exposure the likelihood of cycling was greater for those exposed to BIXI at season 1 (Season 1 OR=1.57, 95% CI: 1.09, 2.27) and season 2 (OR=2.97, 95% CI: 1.97, 4.46) compared to those not exposed to BIXI (see Figure 2 for a graphical representation of the interaction term). Controlling for the weather in step 4 rendered the differences between pre-implementation, season 1, and season 2 survey periods non-significant, while exposure and interaction terms remained statistically significant. The addition of the socio-demographic variables in step 5 attenuated to non significance the association between the likelihood of cycling and the interaction term exposure at season 1 (OR=1.47, 95% CI: 0.99, 2.19).

Utilitarian cycling

In step 1 of analyses examining the relationship between survey period and utilitarian cycling, the likelihood of utilitarian cycling did not differ between season 1 (OR = 0.84; 95% CI: 0.66, 1.06) compared to pre-intervention. Compared to pre-intervention at season 2, the likelihood of utilitarian cycling was lower (OR = 0.72; 95% CI: 0.56, 0.92). In step 2 exposure to BIXI docking stations (OR=3.73, 95% CI: 3.03, 4.59) was associated with a greater likelihood of utilitarian cycling compared to no exposure. In step 3, the interaction term (survey period*exposure to BIXI docking stations) showed that in addition to the main effects of time and exposure, exposure in season 1 (OR=0.76, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.26) and exposure in season 2 (OR=1.52, 95% CI: 0.89, 2.60) were not associated with an increased likelihood of utilitarian cycling. Controlling for weather in step 4 made the relationship between survey period and cycling positive and significant for season 1, and positive and non-significant for season 2. The addition of socio-demographic variables in step 5 did not change the associations between survey period, exposure or the interactions terms and the likelihood of utilitarian cycling.

Recreational cycling

Examining the results for recreational cycling showed that in step 1, the likelihood of recreational cycling was lower at season 1 (OR = 0.42, 95% CI: 0.33, 0.54) and season 2 (OR = 0.24; 95% CI: 0.18, 0.32) compared to pre-intervention. In step 2 exposure to BIXI docking stations (OR=1.75, 95% CI: 1.87, 2.67) was associated with a greater likelihood of recreational cycling compared no exposure. In step 3, the addition of the interaction term (survey period*exposure to BIXI docking stations) showed that in addition to the main effects of exposure at season 1 (OR=2.24, 95% CI: 1.36, 3.59) and exposure at season 2 (OR=3.26, 95% CI: 1.83, 5.80) was associated with an increased likelihood of recreational cycling compared to those not exposed to BIXI. In step 4, addition of the weather variables removed the associations between survey period and exposure and the likelihood of recreational cycling observed in step 3. Socio-demographic variables entered in step 5 did not change the associations between survey period, exposure or the interactions terms and the likelihood of recreational cycling.

Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity analyses presented in Table 3 show that the results for 30 and 45 minutes of total cycling per week were similar to those using 10 minutes of cycling per week as the outcome. Odds ratios for 10, 30, and 45 minutes of cycling per week at season 2 remained statistically significant and were of similar magnitude at 2.86 (95% CI: 1.85, 4.42), 2.54 (95% CI: 1.61, 4.01) and 2.39 (95% CI: 1.48, 3.86), respectively.

DISCUSSION

The primary objective of this study was to examine whether or not a built environment intervention involving the implementation of a PBSP would be associated with a behavioral change of an increased likelihood of cycling for 10 minutes per week for those exposed to BIXI. We hypothesized an increased likelihood of cycling. In ancillary analyses, we examined the contribution of utilitarian and recreational cycling to total cycling and whether the effects remained significant for longer durations of total cycling.

In bivariate analysis, results showed total, utilitarian, and recreational cycling decreased between pre-intervention, season 1, and season 2 on the Island of Montreal. This association can be explained by seasonality and is evident when examining step 4 of our models adjusting for mean weekly temperature and days of precipitation.[34-36] In step 4 of our models the lower likelihood of cycling observed between pre-intervention, season 1, and season 2 was ameliorated, indicating that the weather variables accounted for seasonal differences in cycling.

In fully adjusted models, exposure to BIXI docking stations was significantly associated with increased likelihood of total and utilitarian cycling. Consistent with implementation of PBSPs in other cities,[24] BIXI in Montreal was implemented in areas with environmental characteristics (e.g., high population density, high workplace density, high mixed land use and cycling lanes) associated with greater likelihood of utilitarian cycling.[37-40] The non-significant associations between the built environment characteristics (i.e., mixed land use, street connectivity) and cycling in fully adjusted models may in part be explained by exposure to BIXI docking stations being a proxy for these characteristics. Examining whether or not exposure to BIXI docking stations was associated with a greater likelihood of cycling across time (i.e., testing of interaction terms) showed that after season 1 those exposed were not significantly more likely to cycle although the impact was in the hypothesized direction and neared statistical significance. Those exposed at season 2 had a significantly greater likelihood of cycling. The results show a lagged association between implementation of the BIXI intervention and greater cycling. This is consistent with discussions of built environmental interventions which suggest that this lagged effect may be the result of behavioral modeling.[41, 42]

Examining the contributions of utilitarian and recreational cycling to the effects observed on total cycling showed that the likelihood of utilitarian cycling was significantly greater throughout the Island of Montreal but not specifically for those exposed to the BIXI program. Opposite associations were observed for recreational cycling with no significantly greater likelihood of cycling on the Island of Montreal but a significantly greater likelihood for those exposed to the BIXI program. This suggests that recreational cycling may contribute more to the observed increase in total cycling for respondents exposed to BIXI docking stations to the program in season 1 and season 2.

Sensitivity analyses support the public health potential of the intervention for increasing physical activity. Estimates of the impact remained statistically significant for 30 and 45 minute bouts of physical activity representing 20% and 37.5% of the weekly recommended dose.

Limitations

Evaluations of built environment interventions are subject to multiple sources of bias due to limited control. Limitations include, selection bias, confounding, and the repeat cross sectional design which does not control for all omitted variables.[46] Not including cellular telephones in the sampling could under represent younger people, while women are more likely respond to landline telephones. The sample may over represent older women who are less likely to cycle.[36] Selection could bias the results of the regressions models however, weighting and including control variables in the logistic regression analysis are methods to control for this potential selection bias.[47] There are potentially other weather factors, such as hours of daylight and wind that could have biased the results. However, temperature and precipitation are the most commonly examined weather predictors of cycling and likely act as good proxies for any other potential weather confounders. This study indicates that exposure to BIXI docking stations across time is associated with greater likelihood of total and recreational cycling, in Montreal. However, in Canada and Montreal specifically, there have been secular trends toward greater levels of population cycling since 1994.[48] Secular trends toward increased cycling be explained by media campaigns[49] or a lagged effect of implementing a number of different cycling infrastructures since 2000.[50, 51] Between the pre implementation and end of the second season, only minor changes were made to Montreal's cycle network. Differences between survey respondents across time points on measured or unmeasured variables not included in the modeling may also bias the results of comparisons between repeated cross sectional surveys.

Conclusions

The BIXI public bicycle share program in Montreal was associated with greater likelihood of cycling after the second season of implementation for respondents exposed to the BIXI program. The present study adds to the growing consensus that built environment interventions can result in population level behavior change.

References

1. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Frank LD. Environmental correlates of walking and cycling: Findings from the transportation, urban design and planning literatures. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 2003;25:89-91.

2. Sallis JF, Cervero RB, Archer W, Henderson KA, Kraft MK, Kerr J. An ecological approach to creating active living communities. *Annual Review of Public Health* 2006;27:297-322.

3. Barnes G, Thompson K, Krizek K. A longitudinal analysis of the effect of bicycle facilities on commute mode share. In: *85th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*. Washington, DC; 2006.

4. Woodcock J, Banister D, Edwards P, Prentice AM, Roberts I. Energy and transport. *Lancet* 2007;370:1078-1088.

5. Frank LD, Greenwald MJ, Winkelman S, Chapman J, Kavage S. Carbonless footprints: Promoting health and climate stabilization through active transportation. *Preventive Medicine* 2010;50(S1):S99-S105.

6. Frank LD, Sallis JF, Conway TL, Chapman JE, Saelens BE, Bachman W. Many pathways from land use to health: Associations between neighborhood walkability and active transportation, body mass index, and air quality *Journal of the American Planning Association* 2006;72(1):75-87.

7. Hamer M, Chida Y. Active commuting and cardiovascular risk: a meta-analytic review. *Prev Med* 2008;46(1):9-13.

8. Barengo NC, Kastarinend M, Lakkaa T, Nissinenc A, Tuomilehtoe J. Different forms of physical activity and cardiovascular risk factors among 24–64-year-old men and women in Finland. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation* 2006;13:51-59.

9. Hu G, Pekkarinen H, Hänninen O, Tian H, Guo Z. Relation between commuting, leisure time physical activity and serum lipids in a Chinese urban population. *Annals of Human Biology* 2001;28:412-421.

10. Hu G, Pekkarinen H, Hänninen O, Yu Z, Guo Z, Tian H. Commuting, leisure-time physical activity, and cardiovascular risk factors in China. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2002;34:234-238.

11. von Huth Smith L, Borch-Johnsen K, Jørgensen T. Commuting physical activity is favorably associated with biological risk factors for cardiovascular disease. *European Journal of Epidemiology* 2007;22(11):771–779.

12. Wagner A, Simon C, Ducimetiere P, et al. Leisure-time physical activity and regular walking or cycling to work are associated with adiposity and 5y weight gain in middle-aged men: the PRIME study. *International Journal of Obesity* 2001;25:940-948.

13. de Hartog JJ, Boogaard H, Nijland H, Hoek G. Do the health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks? *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010;118(8):1109-1116.

14. Rojas-Rueda D, A de Nazelle, Tainio M, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ. The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: health impact assessment study. *British Medical Journal* 2011;343:d4521.

15. Statistics Canada. Census of Canada: Profile of census divisions and census subdivisions. In: Statistics Canada, ed. Ottawa, Ontario; 2006.

16. League of American Bicyclists. Bicycle Commuting Trends. In: American Community Survey; 2008.

17. Bergman P, Grjibovski AM, Hagströmer M, Patterson E, Sjöström M. Congestion road tax and physical activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2010;38(2):171-177.

18. Fitzhugh EC, Jr DRB, Evans MF. Urban trails and physical activity: A natural experiment. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2010;39(3):259-262.

19. MacDonald JM, Stokes RJ, Cohen DA, Kofner A, Ridgeway GK. The effect of light rail transit

on body mass index and physical activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2010;39(2):105-112.
20. Ogilvie D, Egan M, Hamilton M, Petticrew M. Promoting walking and cycling as an alternative to using cars: systematic review. *British Medical Journal* 2004;329:763-767.
21. Ogilvie D, Foster CE, Rothnie H, et al. Interventions to promote walking: Systematic review. *British Medical Journal* 2007;334:1204-1214.
22. Pucher J, Dill J, Handy S. Infrastructure, Programs, and Policies to Increase Bicycling: An International Review. *Preventive Medicine* 2009;50(S1):S106-S125.
23. Wells NM, Yang Y. Neighborhood design and walking: A quasi-experimental longitudinal study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2008;34(4):313-319.
24. Shaheen SA, Guzman S, Zhang H. Bikesharing in Europe, the Americas, and Asia: Past, present and future. *Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting* 2010.
25. Fuller D, Gauvin L, Kestens Y, et al. Use of a new public bicycle share program in Montreal, Canada. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2011;4(11):80-83.
26. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjostrom M, et al. International Physical Activity Questionnaire: 12 country reliability and validity. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 2003(35):1381-1395.
27. Gauvin L, Riva M, Barnett T, Richard L, Craig CL. Association between neighborhood active living potential and walking. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2008;167(8):944-953.
28. Riva M, Gauvin L, Apparicio P, Brodeur J-M. Disentangling the relative influence of built and socioeconomic environments on walking: The contribution of areas homogenous along exposures of interest. *Social Science & Medicine* 2009;69(9):1296-1305.
29. McCormack GR, Cerin E, Leslie E, Du Toit L, Owen N. Objective versus perceived walking distance to destinations: Correspondence and predictive validity. *Environment and Behavior* 2008;40:401-425.
30. Environment Canada. Canadian Climate Normals 1971-2000. Available at: http://www.climate.weatheroffice.gc.ca/climate_normals/index_e.html. Accessed June 2 2011.
31. Riva M, Apparicio P, Gauvin L, Brodeur J-M. Establishing the soundness of administrative spatial units for operationalising the active living potential of residential environments: an exemplar for designing optimal zones. *International Journal of Health Geographics* 2008;7(1):43-56.
32. Card D, Krueger AB. Minimum Wages and Employment: A case study of the fast-food industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. *American Economic Review* 1994;84(4):772-793.
33. Meyer BD. Natural and Quasi-Experiments in Economics. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 1995;13(2):151-161.
34. Butler GP, Orpana HM, Wiens AJ. By your own two feet - Factors associated with active transport in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 2006;98:259 - 264.
35. Nankervis M. The effect of weather and climate on bicycle commuting. *Transportation Research Part A* 1999;33(417-431).
36. Winters M, Friesen MC, Koehoorn M, Teschke K. Utilitarian Bicycling: A multilevel analysis of climate and personal influences. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2007;32(1):52-58.
37. Cervero R, Sarmiento O, Jacoby E, Gomez L, Neiman A. Influences of built environment on walking and cycling: Lessons from Bogota. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation* 2009;3(4):203-226.
38. Cohen D, Sehgal A, Williamson S, et al. Impact of a new bicycle path on physical activity. *Preventive Medicine* 2008;46(1):80-81.
39. Dill J. Where do people bicycle? The role of infrastructure in determining bicycling behavior. Available at: www.activelivingresearch.org/node/11692. Accessed.
40. Winters M, Brauer M, Setton EM, Teschke K. Built environment influences on health transportation choices: Bicycling versus driving. *Journal of Urban Health* 2010;87(6):969-993.
41. Glass TA. Psychosocial intervention. In: Berkman LF, Kawachi I, eds. *Social Epidemiology*.

Toronto: Oxford University Press; 2000.
42. Krizek K, Handy S, Forsyth A. Explaining changes in walking and bicycling behavior: Challenges for transportation research. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 2009;36(4):725-740.
43. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *British Medical Journal* 2008;337(a1655):979-983.
44. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Complex interventions: How "out of control" can a randomised controlled trial be? *British Medical Journal* 2004;328(7455):1561-1563.
45. Petticrew M, Cummins S, Ferrell C, et al. Natural experiements an underused tool for public health. *Public Health* 2005;119(751-757):751.
46. Campbell DT, Stanley J. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; 1963.
47. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of Health Surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1999.
48. Juneau E, Potvin L. Trends in leisure-, transport-, and work-related physical activity in Canada 1994-2005. *Preventive Medicine* 2010;51(5):384-386.
49. Vélo Québec. L'État du vélo au Québec en 2005. Available at: http://www.velo.qc.ca/velo_quebec/etatduvelo.php. Accessed July 2 2010.
50. Plan de Transport de Montreal. Available at: http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=4577,68231602&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL. Accessed February 18 2011.
51. Larsen J, El-Geneidy A. A travel behavior analysis of urban cycling facilities in Montréal Canada. *Transportation Research Part D* 2011;16(2):172-177.
52. BIXI's cousins recognized. Available at: https://montreal.bixi.com/about-bixi/news/2011/04/17/les-cousins-de-bixi-reconnus. Accessed September 1 2011.

Table 1. Unweighted and weighted sociodemographic characteristics of residents of the Island of Montreal, Canada surveyed prior to (n=1803), at the of the first season (n=2223) and second season (n=2392) of implementation of the BIXI public bicycle share program.

	Pre-implementation Observed percent (n)	Weighted estimate Pre-implementation percent (n)	Season 1 Observed percentage (n)	Weighted estimate Season 1 percent (n)	Season 2 Observed percentage (n)	Weighted estimate Season 2 percent (n)
Cycling						
No cycling	82.2 (1482)	80.3	89.1 (1981)	87.7	91.3 (2184)	91.2
Cycling	17.8 (321)	19.7	10.9 (242)	12.3	8.7 (208)	8.8
Utilitarian Cycling						
No Utilitarian cycling	92.1 (1660)	91.2	93.5 (2079)	92.4	93.7 (2242)	93.5
Utilitarian Cycling	7.9 (143)	8.8	6.5 (144)	7.6	6.3 (150)	6.5
Recreational Cycling						
No Recreational cycling	88.7 (1599)	87.5	94.7 (2106)	94.3	96.7 (2313)	96.9
Recreational Cycling	11.3 (204)	12.5	5.3 (117)	5.7	3.3 (79)	3.1
BIXI Docking Station Exposure						
No exposed	58.6 (1056)	58.3	64.7 (1438)	51.6	66.5 (1590)	49.2
Exposed	41.4 (747)	41.7	35.3 (785)	31.8	33.5 (802)	30.8
Mean Weekly Temperature	12.9°C (55.2°F)	12.9°C (55.2°F)	4.1°C (39.4°F)	4.0°C (39.2°F)	1.2°C (34.2°F)	1.1°C (33.9°F)
Days of Precipitation per week	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6
Age						
18-29 years	14.8 (266)	27.2	16.6 (370)	30.9	14.0 (334)	28.4
30-59 years	56.2 (1015)	50.9	57.8 (1286)	48.3	57.5 (1375)	50.5
60+ years	29.0 (522)	21.9	25.5 (567)	20.9	28.6 (683)	21.7
Sex						
Male	43.3 (781)	48.4	38.2 (849)	47.3	41.0 (980)	48.1
Female	56.7 (1022)	51.6	61.8 (1374)	52.7	59.0 (1412)	51.9
Education						
High School or less	30.4 (548)	31.2	27.5 (612)	30.5	24.5 (586)	27.0
Trade School	9.4 (169)	9.6	6.3 (141)	6.1	5.8 (138)	5.6
College Degree	9.2 (166)	9.9	14.3 (318)	15.0	15.3 (365)	15.8
University Degree	51.0 (920)	49.3	51.8 (1152)	48.3	53.3 (1276)	50.5
Employment						
Full time	48.5 (875)	47.4	52.3 (1162)	47.9	46.7 (1118)	45.1
Part time	6.8 (123)	6.3	6.9 (154)	7.3	7.7 (183)	7.0
Student	9.5 (171)	17.7	9.5 (211)	18.1	8.6 (205)	16.8
Retired	23.8 (429)	18.4	20.0 (445)	16.8	22.7 (542)	18.0
Other	11.4 (205)	10.3	11.3 (251)	9.9	12.8 (306)	11.4
Body Mass Index						
Normal/Underweight	54.5 (955)	56.4	58.9 (1273)	60.9	56.9 (1315)	59.7
Overweight	32.0 (561)	31.2	29.5 (639)	28.0	30.7 (709)	28.8
Obese	13.4 (235)	12.4	11.6 (251)	11.1	12.4 (286)	11.4
Self-rated health						
Excellent	23.9 (431)	23.7	26.6 (591)	25.5	22.3 (533)	22.8
Very Good	33.7 (607)	34.8	32.9 (729)	32.7	34.5 (826)	34.7
Good	24.1 (435)	24.3	25.1 (557)	26.5	655 (27.4)	27.9
Average	14.1 (254)	13.8	12.3 (272)	12.6	12.1 (290)	11.4
Poor	4.2 (76)	3.5	3.1 (70)	2.7	3.6 (85)	3.1

Table 2. Associations between total, utilitarian, and recreational cycling, survey period, exposure to docking stations, and their interactions controlling for built environment and socio-demographic characteristics among respondents sampled at prior to (n=1803), at the end of the first season (n=2223) and second season (n=2393) of implementation of the BIXI public bicycle share program in Montreal, Canada.

Cycling	Step 1 OR (95% CI)	Step 2 OR (95% CI)	Step 3 OR (95% CI)	Step 4 OR (95% CI)[a]	Step 5 OR (95% CI)[b]
Survey Period					
Pre (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1	0.56 (0.47; 0.67)*	0.59 (0.49; 0.71)*	0.47 (0.36; 0.61)*	1.04 (0.61; 1.77)	1.07 (0.62; 1.86)
Season 2	0.40 (0.33; 0.49)*	0.42 (0.35; 0.52)*	0.23 (0.17; 0.31)*	0.65 (0.33; 1.27)	0.66 (0.33; 1.31)
Exposure to Docking Stations					
Not exposed (Ref)		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Exposed		2.62 (2.24, 3.07)*	1.69 (1.31, 2.16)*	1.69 (1.32, 2.18)*	1.35 (1.02, 1.78)*
Survey*Exposure					
Pre*Not exposed (Ref)			1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1*Exposed			1.57 (1.09; 2.27)*	1.41 (0.96; 2.01)†	1.47 (0.99; 2.19)†
Season 2*Exposed			2.97 (1.97; 4.46)*	2.55 (1.68; 3.88)*	2.86 (1.85; 4.42)*
Utilitarian Cycling					
Survey Period					
Pre (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1	0.84 (0.66; 1.06)	0.92 (0.72; 1.17)	1.07 (0.72; 1.60)	2.34 (1.17; 4.67)*	2.52 (1.24; 5.12)*
Season 2	0.72 (0.56; 0.92)*	0.79 (0.61; 1.01)	0.59 (0.38; 0.93)*	1.63 (0.69; 3.40)	1.72 (0.71; 4.13)
Exposure to Docking Stations					
Not exposed (Ref)		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Exposed		3.73 (3.03, 4.59)*	3.63 (2.48, 5.29)*	3.58 (2.45, 5.22)*	2.59 (1.72, 3.91)*
Survey*Exposure					
Pre*Not exposed (Ref)			1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1*Exposed			0.76 (0.46; 1.26)	0.74 (0.44; 1.25)	0.79 (0.46; 1.35)
Season 2*Exposed			1.52 (0.89; 2.60)	1.45 (0.83; 2.52)	1.66 (0.94; 2.95)†
Recreational Cycling					
Survey Period					
Pre (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1	0.42 (0.33; 0.54)*	0.44 (0.34; 0.56)*	0.29 (0.21; 0.42)*	0.71 (0.34; 1.49)	0.76 (0.36; 1.62)
Season 2	0.24 (0.18; 0.32)*	0.25 (0.19; 0.33)*	0.14 (0.09; 0.21)*	0.43 (0.17; 1.09)†	0.46 (0.18; 1.21)
Exposure to Docking Stations					
Not exposed (Ref)		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Exposed		1.75 (1.87, 2.67)*	1.08 (0.80, 1.46)	1.11 (0.82, 1.50)	0.98 (0.69, 1.38)
Survey*Exposure					
Pre*Not exposed (Ref)			1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1*Exposed			2.24 (1.36; 3.59)*	1.81 (1.10; 2.98)*	1.87 (1.12; 3.13)*
Season 2*Exposed			3.26 (1.83; 5.80)*	2.55 (1.41; 4.59)*	2.73 (1.49; 4.99)*

Notes: [a]Models controlling for mean weekly temperature, days of precipitation. [b]Models controlling for mean weekly temperature, days of precipitation, density of destinations, street connectivity, age, sex, education, employment, body mass index and self-rated health. OR=Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval.

*p<.05; †p<.10

Table 3. Sensitivity analyses using total cycling for 10, 30, and 45 minutes per week and associations with survey period, exposure to docking stations, and their interactions controlling for built environment and socio-demographic characteristics among respondents sampled at prior to (n=1803), at the end of the first season (n=2223) and second season (n=2393) of implementation of the BIXI public bicycle share program in Montreal, Canada.

Cycling	10 minutes per week[a]	30 minutes per week[a]	45 minutes per week[a]
Survey Period			
Pre (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1	1.07 (0.62; 1.86)	1.05 (0.59; 1.86)	0.93 (0.51; 1.69)
Season 2	0.66 (0.33; 1.31)	0.64 (0.31; 1.32)	0.57 (0.27; 1.22)
Exposure to Docking Stations			
Not exposed (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00
Exposed	1.35 (1.02, 1.78)*	1.41 (1.06, 1.89)*	1.44 (1.06, 1.94)*
Survey*Exposure			
Pre*Not exposed (Ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00
Season 1*Exposed	1.47 (0.99; 2.19)[†]	1.39 (0.93; 2.11)	1.36 (0.88; 2.09)
Season 2*Exposed	2.86 (1.85; 4.42)*	2.54 (1.61; 4.01)*	2.39 (1.48; 3.86)*

Notes: [a]Models controlling for mean weekly temperature, days of precipitation, density of destinations, street connectivity, age, sex, education, employment, body mass index and self-rated health. Number (Percent) of cyclists for each analysis, 10 minutes 771 (12%), 30 minutes, 704 (11%), 45 minutes, 617 (9.6%). OR=Odds Ratio; CI=Confidence Interval. *p<.05;[†]p<.10