

Exploring the Relationship Between Household Income and Healthcare Travel Patterns

Amin Bemanian and Jonathan F Mosser

Abstract

Introduction:

Transportation is a social determinant of health which affects how easily individuals attend clinic appointments, obtain medications, or seek emergency care. Despite the importance of transportation, there are few large-scale studies characterizing typical transportation behaviors related to seeking healthcare. This study investigates demographic differences in travel times and transportation mode for healthcare/medical related trips using the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) dataset and identifies potential access inequities.

Methods

Medical trip data was obtained from the 2017 NHTS dataset. All analysis was adjusted by survey weights. Multiple linear regression models were developed to investigate the relationships between demographic variables, transportation mode, and travel time. Additionally, a logistic regression model was used to investigate the relationship between demographics and transportation mode.

Results

Medical trips using public transportation were found to be significantly longer relative to personal automobile trips. Higher household income was found to be associated with shorter travel times, but the effect size decreased with the inclusion of transportation mode. Higher household income respondents were also likely to use public transportation. Respondent race was not significantly associated with any differences in travel times, but there were significant differences across races in public transportation use.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates that individuals with lower household incomes tended to have longer medical trips. Additionally, it identifies public transit to be a potential mediating factor for this difference, as lower-income residents were significantly more likely to use public transit. This analysis highlights the importance of maintaining accessible and efficient public transportation for access to healthcare, especially for populations which have traditionally been at-risk for health disparities.

Introduction

Transportation to health services is often considered to be a determinant of health with transportation barriers and burdens often affecting healthcare access.¹⁻⁵ Transportation barriers have been identified as a common reason for late, rescheduled, or missed healthcare appointments.^{2,6-8} One study by Wolfe et al. analyzing data from the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) estimated that 5.8 million people in the United States delayed some form of medical care due to transportation barriers in 2017.² Transportation barriers have also been associated with lower rates of medication and treatment adherence. A large retrospective study of pharmacy fillings for pediatric medications by Hensley et al. found that individuals living in ZIP codes with lower rates of vehicle ownership were less likely to successfully fill their prescriptions.⁵ Furthermore, transportation has been identified as affecting treatment adherence and efficacy for several chronic diseases including lung cancer chemotherapy,⁹ glycemic control in diabetes,¹⁰ antiepileptic usage,¹¹ and antiretroviral therapy in HIV.¹² These transportation barriers have been shown to disproportionately affect historically disadvantaged populations. Syed et al's 2013 review on the relationship between transportation and health care access found five studies where transportation barriers or travel times were worse for racial or ethnic minorities compared to non-Hispanic Whites, including several which adjusted for the effect of socioeconomic status.¹ In Wolfe et al.'s study of the 2017 NHIS data, there were significant differences in reporting transportation barriers across race/ethnicity, family income, employment, and educational attainment.² There has been very limited research investigating the effects of transportation interventions for healthcare,¹³ but one study by Smith et al. investigated how expansion of a new light rail line affected missed medical appointments in Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota.¹⁴ The study showed the creation of a new light rail resulted in a modest but significant decrease in missed treatments, with the effects being disproportionately concentrated among Medicaid patients.

While there is much literature that identifies potential and perceived relationships between transportation barriers and healthcare access, the majority do not actually measure the travel time or distance of health-related trips. Individual trip data has the benefit of allowing researchers and policymakers to ask more precise questions regarding the processes that cause these barriers such as the effect of transportation mode and vehicle ownership instead on relying on ecological data. One large dataset of individual trip data is the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS).¹⁵ The NHTS is a survey conducted by the Federal Highway Administration every 5 to 10 years with the goal of providing high resolution data for transportation agencies, urban planners, policymakers, and researchers. The survey logs individuals' travel behaviors, including the purpose of each trip. There have been few prior health-related studies using this data. An analysis of the 2001 NHTS by Probst et al. found Black/African American participants were more likely to have to travel 30 minutes or more for a healthcare visit compared to White participants.¹⁶ Another study by Brucker and Rollins using the 2009 NHTS found that participants with medical conditions that limited mobility were more likely to have to travel 26 minutes or more compared to those without, despite not having significantly different trip lengths in miles.¹⁷ Currently, no studies have used the most recent version of the NHTS from 2017 to investigate the relationship between transportation and healthcare access.

Objective

The purpose of this study is to characterize the distribution of medical trip travel times in the 2017 National Household Travel Survey across several different demographic variables and transportation modes in metropolitan and urban settings. Additionally, we test for population groups differences across these variables using multivariable models. Finally, we measure the relationship of transportation mode and travel times and test if there are any relationships between the demographic groups and the selection of transportation mode.

Methods

Data Source

The data source for this analysis was the 2017 NHTS.¹⁵ Households were invited via mail and participants were assigned a specific day to log all travel including trip duration (travel time), purpose, and mode of transportation. This information was then linked to the participant's individual and household demographics. Households were then weighted to create a representative sample for the United States. For this analysis we included all trips whose purpose was listed as "medical/dental services" and whose participant was living in a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) at the time of the survey (n = 13,156 out of all 923,752 trips logged). Trips with travel times greater than 3 standard deviations from the mean were excluded as outliers (threshold of 102 minutes). Demographic variables of interest included participant age, sex, and race/ethnicity and household income, which were all collected using a self-reported survey at time of enrollment.

Analysis

All analyses were done in R using the *survey* package to incorporate design weights in the analysis.¹⁸ Univariable and multivariable relationships with travel time were investigated using a series of linear multiple regression models. Due to the distribution of travel times, time was log-normalized. The first multivariable model (Model 1) included all participant demographic variables but excluded the transportation mode. The second model (Model 2) included all variables in the first and added transportation mode. We then stratified Model 1 by transportation mode to create Models 3a and 3b, which focused on personal automobile and public transit trips respectively. We then investigated the relationship between demographics and transportation mode. Univariable relationships were tested using a chi-squared test with Rao-Scott correction to adjust for design weights. Finally, a multiple logistic regression model (Model 4) was used to further investigate the relationship between demographics and transportation mode, with public transit usage as the outcome of interest. Using this combination of models, we tested whether transportation mode is a potential mediating pathway for the other

relationships using the Baron and Kenny method.¹⁹ Mediation effects were tested using the Sobel test statistic.

Results

Raw distributions of travel time stratified by respondent sex, race/ethnicity, and household income are shown in Figure 1. The survey-weighted mean travel time across all respondents was 23.6 minutes. The mean time among male respondents was slightly longer than female respondents (23.7 vs 23.6 minutes). American Indians/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) were found to have the longest mean time with 28.7 minutes while Asian Americans were found to have the shortest mean time of 19.8 minutes. For household income, respondents within the lowest household income stratum (<\$25,000) were found to have the longest mean travel time of 28.0 minutes and within the highest income stratum (>\$150,000) were found to have the shortest with 19.2 minutes. Public transit users had double the mean travel time relative to personal automobile users (45.0 minutes vs 22.2 minutes). We also calculated the survey-weighted contingency tables for the categorical variables, which are reported in the supplemental table S1.

The first set of univariable models and multivariable models estimating travel time while controlling for demographic variables are shown in Table 1. In both Model 1 and the univariable models, when the lowest income stratum is used as a baseline, all other strata are found to have significantly shorter travel times. Additionally, older respondent age was associated with longer travel times. Respondent race/ethnicity and sex were not significantly associated with differences in travel times. In Model 2, after the addition of transportation mode the effect size of household income decreased across all strata and only two of the six strata still had statistically significant effect (\$75,000 to \$99,999 and > \$149,000). Transportation mode was associated with differences in travel time with respondents who used public transit having significantly longer travel times and respondents who walked having significantly shorter travel times. There was no change to the effects of age, sex, and race/ethnicity.

In Model 3a and 3b (Table 2), Model 1 was stratified by personal automobile and public transit use respectively. In Model 3a, only the highest income stratum (> \$149,999) was significantly different from the lowest income stratum. All other variables were non-significant. In Model 3b, none of the variables were found to be significantly associated with differences in travel time. Table 3 shows the results of the logistic regression (Model 4) for using public transit versus other transportation modes. Higher household income strata were significantly associated with less public transit usage relative to the lowest stratum. In the survey-weighted contingency tables, 21.9% of the trips among the lowest income stratum were using public transit, while only 0 to 5% were using public transit for all the other income strata. Significant differences in race were also found for public transit usage. AI/AN, Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Multiracial respondents were found to have higher relative rates of public transit usage. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and Other Race respondents did not have any occurrences of using public transit for medical trips, and their relative risk in the model was reported as 0. The Sobel test analysis showed significant mediation of public transit for the relationship between travel time and income across all income strata. Furthermore, significant mediation effects were found for race/ethnicity in AI/AN, Black, Hispanic, and Multiracial groups.

Discussion

This analysis leveraged a large publicly available dataset to identify several important population differences in travel times and transportation modes for medical trips. Notably, lower income and older respondents had significantly longer travel times for these trips. Since travel time is intrinsically tied with transportation mode, it was important to determine the role mode played in these relationships. We found strong evidence for a relationship between household income and transportation mode, with the lowest income stratum being 4 to 25 times as likely to use public transit for health-related trips. Controlling transportation mode diminished the strength of the relationship between income and travel time, with the stratified analyses in Models 3a and 3b almost entirely removing the effect from Model 1. Transportation mode was a

significant predictor of travel time, with public transit trips expected to be twice as long in duration relative to personal automobile trips. The combination of results across these models suggests that transportation mode likely mediates the relationship between household income and travel time.

Race/ethnicity was not found to be independently associated with travel time both in the univariable and multivariable models, despite prior studies finding evidence of a relationship.^{1,2,16} However, it is important to note there were racial/ethnic differences between the distributions of travel time, and race/ethnicity was a predictor of public transit use.

Additionally, mediation analysis suggested a positive effect of race/ethnicity on transportation time via transportation mode. The significance of the mediation results for race/ethnicity is difficult to assess, however, since there were no independent effects identified in the univariable or multivariable models. Traditionally, the Baron & Kenny framework for mediation prescribes that there cannot be a clinically significant mediated relationship if there is no independent univariate association.¹⁹ However, other authors have argued this rule is too strict for non-experimental studies, and Strout & Bolger proposed an alternative framework where testing for an independent association is not necessary if the theoretical relationship is hypothesized to be “more distal,”²⁰ This would include relationships which cannot be experimentally tested or if the theoretical relationship is expected to be relatively small and heavily mediated through other processes. Based on this alternate framework, there may be a significant relationship between race/ethnicity and travel time mediated by mode, especially given that we would expect any relationship between race/ethnicity and transportation time to be relatively distant and mediated through several processes. Additionally, these effects may be hard to measure in this study given the relatively small samples for non-Hispanic White individuals. Differences in general transportation mode usage and car ownership across race have been identified in previous studies, with non-Hispanic White individuals found to have higher rates of car ownership and lower rates of transit use compared to individuals of other races/ethnicities.^{21,22} Given the

broader context of the health effects of transportation barriers, the differences identified in this study show how transportation can be a pathway for structural racism for health access and outcomes.

Older age was notably the only other significant predictor for longer travel times, which was also found to be a significant relationship in the Brucker and Rollins analysis of the 2009 NHTS but not in Probst et al.'s analysis of the 2001 NHTS.^{16,17} With mode stratification, the relationship between older age and longer time was unchanged among personal automobile trips but was not significant for public transit trips. Interestingly, there was no significant relationship between age and transportation mode, despite a 2017 study from Klein and Smart showing generational differences in car ownership.²¹

There are some important limitations with this study. First, while the NHTS does report a trip's purpose as "medical/dental services", this is self-reported by the participant and there is not specific instruction for what these trips should include. Therefore, it could include routine clinic visits, acute or emergent care, or long-term therapy visits. Additionally, there may be some classification discrepancies for pharmacy visits as the participant could list them as "shopping/errands" instead. Furthermore, there is a component of survivorship bias due to only actually completed trips being included in this dataset. We cannot account for healthcare trips that were delayed or canceled due to transportation barriers using this data. Finally, in our analysis, we chose only to include trips in metropolitan areas. While this limits the generalizability of this study's results to rural settings, we felt including both would result in too much heterogeneity due to the fundamental differences in transportation behaviors and built environments in urban versus rural populations.

These findings highlight the disproportionate burden that households and individuals with lower incomes face from a transportation standpoint when trying to obtain medical care. Furthermore, it demonstrates why investment in affordable and efficient public transportation should be viewed as a public health need. Based on the findings of our analysis, further work is necessary

to facilitate improved planning and coordination between healthcare organizations and municipal/regional transportation agencies to ensure all individuals have equitable physical access to healthcare.

Works Cited

1. Syed ST, Gerber BS, Sharp LK. Traveling Towards Disease: Transportation Barriers to Health Care Access. *J Community Health*. 2013;38(5):976-993. doi:10.1007/s10900-013-9681-1
2. Wolfe MK, McDonald NC, Holmes GM. Transportation Barriers to Health Care in the United States: Findings From the National Health Interview Survey, 1997–2017. *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(6):815-822. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305579
3. Welty LJ, Harrison AJ, Abram KM, et al. Health disparities in drug- and alcohol-use disorders: A 12-year longitudinal study of youths after detention. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2016;106(5):872-880. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2015.303032
4. Abner EL, Charnigo RJ, Kryscio RJ. Markov chains and semi-Markov models in time-to-event analysis. *Journal of biometrics & biostatistics*. 2013;Suppl 1(e001):19522-19522. doi:10.4172/2155-6180.S1-e001
5. Hensley C, Heaton PC, Kahn RS, Luder HR, Frede SM, Beck AF. Poverty, Transportation Access, and Medication Nonadherence. *Pediatrics*. 2018;141(4):e20173402. doi:10.1542/peds.2017-3402
6. Maldonado LY, Fryer KE, Tucker CM, Stuebe AM. The Association between Travel Time and Prenatal Care Attendance. *Am J Perinatol*. 2020;37(11):1146-1154. doi:10.1055/s-0039-1692455
7. Oluyede L, Cochran AL, Prunkl L, Wang J, Wolfe M, McDonald NC. Unpacking transportation barriers and facilitators to accessing health care: Interviews with care coordinators. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. 2022;13:100565. doi:10.1016/j.trip.2022.100565
8. Kamimura A, Panahi S, Ahmmad Z, Pye M, Ashby J. Transportation and Other Nonfinancial Barriers Among Uninsured Primary Care Patients. *Health Services Research and Managerial Epidemiology*. 2018;5:233339281774968. doi:10.1177/2333392817749681
9. Salloum RG, Smith TJ, Jensen GA, Lafata JE. Factors associated with adherence to chemotherapy guidelines in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2012;75(2):255-260. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2011.07.005
10. Strauss K, MacLean C, Troy A, Littenberg B. Driving Distance as a Barrier to Glycemic Control in Diabetes. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2006;21(4):378-380. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00386.x
11. Welty TE, Willis SL, Welty EA. Effect of limited transportation on medication adherence in patients with epilepsy. *J Am Pharm Assoc (2003)*. 2010;50(6):698-703. doi:10.1331/JAPhA.2010.09081
12. Ridgway JP, Almirol EA, Schmitt J, Schuble T, Schneider JA. Travel Time to Clinic but not Neighborhood Crime Rate is Associated with Retention in Care Among HIV-Positive Patients. *AIDS Behav*. 2018;22(9):3003-3008. doi:10.1007/s10461-018-2094-5

13. Solomon EM, Wing H, Steiner JF, Gottlieb LM. Impact of Transportation Interventions on Health Care Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Medical Care*. 2020;58(4):384. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000001292
14. Smith LB, Yang Z, Golberstein E, Huckfeldt P, Mehrotra A, Neprash HT. The effect of a public transportation expansion on no-show appointments. *Health Services Research*. 2022;57(3):472-481. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13899
15. Federal Highway Administration. *2017 National Household Travel Survey*. US Department of Transportation; 2017. <https://nhts.ornl.gov>
16. Probst JC, Laditka SB, Wang JY, Johnson AO. Effects of residence and race on burden of travel for care: cross sectional analysis of the 2001 US National Household Travel Survey. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2007;7(1):40-40. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-7-40
17. Brucker DL, Rollins NG. Trips to medical care among persons with disabilities: Evidence from the 2009 National Household Travel Survey. *Disability and Health Journal*. 2016;9(3):539-543. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2016.01.001
18. Lumley T. survey: analysis of complex survey samples. Published online 2020.
19. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1986;51(6):1173-1182. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173
20. Shrout PE, Bolger N. Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: new procedures and recommendations. *Psychol Methods*. 2002;7(4):422-445.
21. Klein NJ, Smart MJ. Millennials and car ownership: Less money, fewer cars. *Transport Policy*. 2017;53:20-29. doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2016.08.010
22. Tribby CP, Graubard BI, Berrigan D. National and metropolitan trends in public transit use, transit-related walking, and ridesharing between 2009 and 2017. *Journal of Transport & Health*. 2020;19:100918. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2020.100918




Figure 1: Violin plots showing the distribution of travel times across demographics and travel modes. Box-plot shows IQR and median for reference.

	<i>Univariable Models of Travel Time w/ Demographics and Transportation Mode</i>	<i>Model 1: Travel Time w/ Demographics</i>	<i>Model 2: Travel Time w/ Demographics and Transportation Mode</i>
Household Income			
<\$25,000	1	1	1
\$25,000-49,999	0.850 (0.762, 0.948)	0.860 (0.771, 0.958)	0.952 (0.861, 1.054)
\$50,000-74,999	0.833 (0.760, 0.913)	0.850 (0.774, 0.933)	0.947 (0.866, 1.035)
\$75,000-99,999	0.788 (0.704, 0.882)	0.809 (0.723, 0.905)	0.888 (0.799, 0.988)
\$100,000-124,999	0.817 (0.732, 0.913)	0.855 (0.760, 0.961)	0.957 (0.856, 1.070)
\$125,000-149,999	0.783 (0.682, 0.899)	0.835 (0.726, 0.959)	0.933 (0.813, 1.070)
> \$149,999	0.664 (0.588, 0.749)	0.701 (0.622, 0.791)	0.793 (0.710, 0.887)
Individual Age	1.005 (1.003, 1.007)	1.004 (1.002, 1.006)	1.004 (1.002, 1.005)
Sex			
Male	1	1	1
Female	0.991 (0.926, 1.061)	0.979 (0.916, 1.047)	0.988 (0.928, 1.052)
Race/Ethnicity			
White	1	1	1
American Indian/ Alaska Native	1.067 (0.576, 1.976)	0.984 (0.550, 1.760)	0.809 (0.521, 1.257)
Asian	0.885 (0.769, 1.020)	0.922 (0.804, 1.056)	0.928 (0.814, 1.057)
Black	1.134 (0.992, 1.297)	1.056 (0.929, 1.201)	0.966 (0.855, 1.093)
Hispanic	1.064 (0.958, 1.181)	1.038 (0.936, 1.150)	1.012 (0.919, 1.115)
Multiracial	1.039 (0.917, 1.177)	1.014 (0.896, 1.147)	0.957 (0.856, 1.071)
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0.998 (0.678, 1.468)	1.012 (0.691, 1.482)	1.034 (0.700, 1.526)
Other	1.128 (0.883, 1.442)	1.128 (0.871, 1.461)	1.144 (0.874, 1.496)
Transportation Mode			
Personal Automobile	1	-	1
Public Transit	2.155 (1.899, 2.446)	-	2.044 (1.796, 2.326)
Walking	0.543 (0.453, 0.650)	-	0.550 (0.465, 0.652)
Biking	0.559 (0.272, 1.147)	-	0.609 (0.330, 1.124)
Taxi/Rideshare	1.183 (0.889, 1.576)	-	1.145 (0.869, 1.507)

Table 1: Model 1 and 2 looking at the relationship of demographic variables and transportation with travel times. All coefficients are reported as fold change with the 95% confidence interval in parentheses. Bolded parameters are significant at $p < 0.05$.

	<i>Model 3a: Travel Time for Personal Automobile Users</i>	<i>Model 3b: Travel Time for Public Transit Users</i>
Household Income		
<\$25,000	1	1
\$25,000-49,999	0.959 (0.859, 1.071)	1.040 (0.726, 1.488)
\$50,000-74,999	0.940 (0.857, 1.031)	1.208 (0.924, 1.579)
\$75,000-99,999	0.899 (0.802, 1.007)	1.034 (0.654, 1.634)
\$100,000-124,999	0.979 (0.870, 1.101)	0.837 (0.537, 1.305)
\$125,000-149,999	0.929 (0.806, 1.072)	0.970 (0.545, 1.727)
> \$149,999	0.818 (0.727, 0.921)	1.279 (1.000, 1.637) [†]
Individual Age	1.003 (1.002, 1.005)	1.000 (0.995, 1.006)
Sex		
Male	1	1
Female	1.001 (0.937, 1.070)	0.922 (0.722, 1.178)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	1	1
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.688 (0.447, 1.059)	1.243 (0.645, 2.396)
Asian	0.882 (0.769, 1.012)	1.564 (1.009, 2.424)
Black	0.968 (0.841, 1.115)	1.091 (0.799, 1.490)
Hispanic	1.017 (0.913, 1.132)	1.139 (0.887, 1.464)
Multiracial	0.946 (0.842, 1.064)	1.040 (0.690, 1.569)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.037 (0.704, 1.527)	-
Other	1.161 (0.881, 1.531)	-

Table 2: Model 3a and 3b looking at the relationship of demographic variables on travel times stratified by transportation mode (personal automobiles and public transit). All coefficients are reported as fold change with the 95% confidence interval in parentheses. Bolded parameters are significant at $p < 0.05$. Note: There were no NH/PI or Other Race public transit users resulting in those coefficients to not be fit for model 3b. [†]p-value of 0.0511, lower bound rounds up to 1.000.

	<i>Model 4: Public Transit Use vs Other Modes</i>	<i>Sobel Test Statistic for Travel Time</i>	<i>Sobel Test p- value</i>
Household Income			
<\$25,000	1		
\$25,000-49,999	0.163 (0.086, 0.310)	-4.936	< 0.001
\$50,000-74,999	0.152 (0.082, 0.281)	-5.240	< 0.001
\$75,000-99,999	0.239 (0.122, 0.468)	-3.898	< 0.001
\$100,000-124,999	0.068 (0.022, 0.207)	-4.335	< 0.001
\$125,000-149,999	0.038 (0.014, 0.101)	-5.601	< 0.001
> \$149,999	0.108 (0.054, 0.218)	-5.399	< 0.001
Individual Age	1.009 (0.998, 1.020)	1.618	0.106
Sex			
Male	1		
Female	0.972 (0.645, 1.463)	-0.137	0.891
Race/Ethnicity			
White	1		
American Indian/Alaska Native	9.050 (2.878, 28.457)	3.562	< 0.001
Asian	1.211 (0.433, 3.387)	0.366	0.715
Black	3.936 (2.383, 6.503)	4.798	< 0.001
Hispanic	2.635 (1.576, 4.405)	3.500	< 0.001
Multiracial	3.089 (1.201, 7.944)	2.287	0.022
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0 (0, 0.00001)	-	-
Other	0 (0, 0.00001)	-	-

Table 3: Model 4 looking at the relationship of demographic variables on the likelihood of taking public transit for a medical trip. Model coefficients are reported as the relative risk with the 95% confidence interval in parentheses. Sobel test statistic and p-value reported for the predicted mediation effect of each variable through public transit in the multivariate travel time model (Model 2). Note: There were no NH/PI or Other Race public transit users resulting in a RR of 0.

	Personal Automobile	Public Transit Use	Other	Total
Household Income				
Less than \$25,000	170.7	54.1	22.0	246.8
\$25,000 - 49,999	211.0	8.7	6.7	226.4
\$50,000 - 74,999	122.8	3.8	6.2	132.8
\$75,000 - 99,999	97.1	4.7	3.5	105.3
\$100,000 - 124,999	92.1	1.0	4.2	97.3
\$125,000 - 149,999	55.7	0.3	1.8	57.8
\$150,000 and higher	121.5	2.3	9.7	133.5
Race/Ethnicity				
White	568.5	21.0	25.8	615.3
AI/AN	2.0	1.0	0.0	2.9
Asian	30.9	1.2	2.9	34.9
Black	102.0	28.7	11.3	142.0
Hispanic	136.7	19.0	13.0	168.6
Multiracial	24.5	4.2	1.0	29.6
NH/PI	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Other	5.5	0.0	0.1	5.5
Gender				
Female	537.5	51.6	38.3	627.5
Male	333.4	23.4	15.7	372.5

Supplement S1: Contingency table of categorical demographic variables by transportation mode. Reported values are weighted counts instead of raw counts to adjust for survey weighting, Using a simulated sample pool of 1000 respondents. Note there may be some slight discrepancies due to rounding.