



1 **Summer heat, historic redlining, and neighborhood walking among older adults: 2017**

2 **National Household Travel Survey**

3 Diana Mitsova, PhD^a, Lilah M. Besser, PhD^b, Elaine T. Le, BA^b

4

5 ^a Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida,

6 dmitsova@fau.edu

7 ^b Comprehensive Center for Brain Health, Department of Neurology, University of Miami, Boca

8 Raton, FL; lmb9767@miami.edu

9 Corresponding author: Diana Mitsova; dmitsova@fau.edu

10

11

12 **Abstract**

13 No known studies have examined the relationships between urban heat islands, historic redlining,
14 and neighborhood walking in older adults. We assessed whether: 1) individual and neighborhood
15 characteristics (including redlining score) differ by neighborhood summer land surface
16 temperature (LST); 2) higher LST is associated with less neighborhood walking, and whether
17 associations differ by historic redlining score; and 3) neighborhoods with discriminatory
18 redlining scores have greater LSTs. We used data on 3,982 ≥ 65 -year olds from the 2017 National
19 Household Travel Survey. Multivariable negative binomial and linear regressions tested
20 associations between LST z-score (comparing participant's neighborhood LST to surrounding
21 region's LST) and self-reported neighborhood walking, and the association between living in
22 neighborhoods redlined as "definitely declining" or "hazardous" (versus "still desirable"/"best")
23 and LST z-score. LSTs were higher for those in neighborhoods with higher area deprivation
24 scores and more African American/Black residents. Older adults living in neighborhoods with
25 higher summer LST z-scores had fewer minutes of neighborhood walking/day. This association
26 seemed limited to individuals with neighborhood redlining scores of "still desirable"/"best".
27 Neighborhood redlining scores of "definitely declining" or "hazardous" (versus "still desirable"
28 and "best") were associated with greater neighborhood summer LSTs. Overall, these findings
29 suggest that historically redlined neighborhoods may more often experience urban heat island
30 effects, and older adults living in hotter neighborhoods may less often engage in neighborhood
31 walking. Future work is needed to elucidate the impact of extreme heat on health promoting
32 behaviors such as walking and the types of interventions that can successfully counteract
33 negative impacts to historically disadvantaged communities.

34

35 **Introduction**

36 Engaging in regular low-intensity physical activity, including walking, offers numerous health
37 benefits for older adults.¹ A vast range of observational and interventional studies consistently
38 have documented that regular exercise helps improve cardiovascular and respiratory system
39 function, reducing the risk of heart disease and high blood pressure.² Regular moderate-intensity
40 exercise improves the functioning of the immune system and can enhance bone density, reducing
41 the risk of osteoporosis.³ Studies also suggest an association between physical activity and cell
42 physiology linked to the genesis of cognitive decline.¹ Exercise is also associated with mental
43 health benefits.^{4,5} Recent meta-analyses provided evidence that walking can effectively reduce the
44 symptoms of anxiety and depression and improve sleep health.¹ In addition, exercise in a group
45 setting can provide opportunities for social interaction, easing feelings of isolation and loneliness
46 commonly associated with aging.⁶

47
48 The walkability of a neighborhood is determined by several factors, including street connectivity
49 and density^{7,8}, access to destinations and aesthetics^{9,10}, investment in walking and biking
50 infrastructure¹¹, and the presence/absence of urban natural features, specifically tree cover.¹²
51 Several recent studies have investigated the effects of greenspace on physical activity, providing
52 consistent evidence of the beneficial effects of urban nature-based infrastructure on health
53 outcomes.^{13,14} Tree canopy strongly influences urban air temperature¹² and can reduce land surface
54 temperature by as much as 2.9°F.¹⁵

55
56 Despite the growing evidence of the cooling effect of vegetation and tree cover in urbanized areas,
57 many neighborhoods in impoverished and minority communities have been found to lack access

58 to these ecosystem services.¹² The patterns of inequality in greenspace distribution and
59 associations with hotter microclimates emerge in multiple incorporated and unincorporated urban
60 areas across the United States.^{12,16-21} These patterns contribute to the urban heat island effect first
61 described by Oke *et al.* in a study of sensible heat storage in the urban core of Mexico City.²² In
62 essence, the urban heat island effect is the persistence of higher temperatures in urban centers
63 compared to the surrounding rural or natural areas.²³ Land surface temperature (LST) derived from
64 Landsat 8 Thermal Infrared Sensors (TIRS) has been extensively used to demarcate the spatial
65 boundaries of the urban heat island effect.²⁴⁻²⁶

66
67 Various studies have assessed the associations between urban heat island effects and exposure of
68 vulnerable populations to heat-related health risks.^{16,27-29} For instance, an in-depth analysis of the
69 causes of the high mortality rates of the 1995 Chicago heat wave study found that disproportionate
70 exposure of socially vulnerable groups, social isolation of seniors, and institutional neglect of poor
71 and racialized neighborhoods have contributed to the observed disastrous outcomes.²⁷ A study of
72 the urban heat island effect in 25 cities around the world observed that low-income neighborhoods
73 consistently exhibit lower vegetation density and are more likely to experience higher levels of
74 heat exposure.¹⁸ Mitchell & Chakraborty¹⁶ developed a composite "urban heat risk index" based
75 on the physical characteristics of the urban environment, such as LST, urban form and building
76 density, and amount of greenspace. The index was applied to the cities of Los Angeles, Chicago,
77 and New York in conjunction with indicators of social vulnerability. The study found that census
78 tracts with higher percentages of racial and ethnic minorities had a strong positive correlation with
79 heat exposure, but did not establish consistent evidence of an association between the urban heat
80 risk index and disproportionate exposure of older adults.¹⁶ Similarly, another study²³ observed a

81 nonsignificant statistical association between heat exposure and isolation of older adults (percent
82 65 and older who live alone) in Portland, Oregon. A study that analyzed urban heat islands in 175
83 large US cities observed that racial and ethnic minorities (versus white) experience higher
84 temperatures in 97% of the studied cases, but found no evidence of higher UHI intensities for older
85 adults.²¹ Using remote sensing and census data, another study established widespread urban heat
86 disparities in 1000 counties in the continental US.²⁰ Lastly, a study that explored the association
87 between tree cover, land surface temperatures, and income in 5,723 US communities found that
88 poorer neighborhoods have, on average, 15% less vegetative cover and are more likely to
89 experience higher temperatures (as much as 1.5°C hotter) than more affluent subdivisions.¹²
90 Moreover, the study established a strong correlation between a higher percentage of tree cover and
91 higher income in 92% of the urbanized areas.¹²

92
93 Research suggests that historic policies of housing discrimination, such as redlining, have
94 contributed to the disproportionate exposure of low-income urban populations to extreme heat.^{14,28-}

95 ³⁰ Redlining, instituted in the US in the 1930s, was a lending practice that discriminated against
96 individuals living in minority, low-income, and migrant communities.²⁸⁻³¹ These neighborhoods
97 were redlined or color-coded red ("hazardous") on maps used for mortgage/insurance
98 considerations by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC), resulting in the denial of
99 mortgage and property insurance applications.²⁸⁻³⁰ One potential impact of historic redlining
100 policies is the lasting impact on the built environment³¹, including less greenspace/tree canopy and
101 more pavement, leading to an increased chance of urban heat island effects. A study examining
102 intra-urban LST anomalies in 108 urbanized areas in the US found that historically redlined
103 neighborhoods, which remain predominantly communities of color, are experiencing higher levels
104 of intra-urban heat than their more affluent counterparts.²⁸ Another study examined LST derived

105 from remote sensing (as a measure of heat exposure) and the Normalized Difference Vegetation
106 Index (NDVI) (as a measure of vegetative cover) in formerly redlined neighborhoods in Baltimore,
107 Dallas, and Kansas City.²⁹ The findings suggest that mean NDVI was lower while mean LST was
108 higher in nearly all historically redlined neighborhoods compared to higher-income communities.
109 An investigation of heat-related emergency room visits in 11 Texas cities found a significant
110 association between a greater percentage of redlined areas, elevated levels of heat exposure, and
111 higher rates of outpatient visits and inpatient admissions.³⁰ Lastly, individuals ≥ 65 years old in the
112 2017 National Household Travel Survey who lived in historically redlined communities reported
113 spending less time walking in their neighborhoods.

114
115 Despite prior evidence suggesting that various health outcomes are affected by historic redlining
116 and heat exposure, few studies have examined how redlining and urban heat islands may impact
117 neighborhood walking in older adults. To address these gaps, in this study we assessed: 1) how
118 individual and neighborhood characteristics differ (including historic redlining score) depending
119 on neighborhood maximum summer LST; 2) whether higher LST is associated with less
120 neighborhood walking among older adults, and whether these associations differ by historic
121 redlining score; and 3) whether neighborhoods with discriminatory historic redlining scores have
122 greater LSTs.

123

124 **Methods**

125 We used data from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), a cross-sectional survey
126 of travel behavior (e.g., travel modes and destinations) completed by 264,234 individuals from
127 129,696 households. NHTS respondents completed online/phone surveys and recorded trip details
128 during a single travel diary day (Monday-Sunday). The study was deemed not human subjects

129 research by University of Miami's Institutional Review Board. We restricted it to ≥ 65 -year-olds
130 living in US Census tracts with data available on historical redlining scores and summer LSTs.

131

132 *Land surface temperature*

133 Aggregated daytime maximum LST data for a 40-day timespan from July to August 2013 were
134 downloaded from the Center for International Earth Science Information Network. Descriptive
135 statistics, including mean, min, max, range and standard deviation (SD) for LST, were derived
136 for both census tracts and core-based statistical areas (CBSA) using the zonal statistics algorithm
137 in ESRI's ArcMap 10.8.1. Standardized scores were used to compare LST values at the
138 respondent's Census tract level to the surrounding region/CBSA and represented the standardized
139 peak summertime LST. The LST z-scores used in our analyses were calculated by dividing the
140 difference between the mean LSTs at the census tract and CBSA levels by the SD of the LST for
141 the CBSA. More positive z-scores indicate that the participant's neighborhood (Census tract) had
142 a higher maximum LST than the surrounding region.

143

144 *Neighborhood walking*

145 Self-reported time on walking trips was obtained from travel diaries that were completed by
146 NHTS participants on their assigned diary day. Any walking trip that began, ended, or originated
147 and terminated at the respondent's residence was included in the calculation of total minutes
148 spent walking in the neighborhood for that day.

149

150

151

152 *Neighborhood characteristics*

153 We linked data on social and built environment characteristics, including redlining scores using
154 the respondents' US Census tract IDs provided by Federal Highway Administration. HOLC map
155 mortgage investment risk scores were downloaded from a publicly available website (scores: 1="best", 2="still desirable", 3="definitely declining", and 4="hazardous"). Meier et al³²
156 previously derived these scores using equal intervals to assign the four redlining score categories
157 to each US Census tract.
158

159
160 Population density (people/mi²) and percentage of African American/Black and Hispanic/LatinX
161 residents at the census tract level were obtained from the NHTS dataset and the American
162 Community Survey (ACS, 2017 5-year estimates). The area deprivation index (ADI),
163 downloaded from University of Wisconsin's Neighborhood Atlas, ranks census block groups by
164 neighborhood disadvantage based on 2011-2015 ACS estimates of income, education,
165 employment, and housing (1%-lowest to 100%-highest disadvantage).³³ We derived a tract-level
166 measure by averaging the block-group ADI values within respondents' Census tracts. We
167 downloaded 2011 National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) data from the National Historic GIS
168 website (NHGIS).³⁴ NHGIS processed NLCD data to determine the proportion of each tract
169 covered by 16 land cover types (e.g., high intensity development, developed open space, forest).
170 For this study, we calculated the percentage of the respondent's census tract composed of any
171 greenspace (i.e., developed open space, forest, shrub/scrub; grassland/herbaceous, farmland, and
172 wetlands). Further information on the NLCD classifications is published elsewhere^{35,36}. We also
173 report the participants' Census regions as walking differences have been observed among older
174 adults based on Census region.³⁷

175

176 *Covariates*

177 The respondent demographics included age (years), sex, education (<high school degree, high
178 school degree, some college, bachelor's degree, graduate/professional degree), 4-category
179 household income (originally collected in \$10,000/year categories), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic
180 White, African American/Black, Hispanic, Asian, other).

181

182 *Statistical methods*

183 We calculated frequencies and percentages for the respondent demographics and neighborhood
184 built and social environment characteristics (including redlining score) by neighborhood LST z-
185 score quartile (Q1=coolest; Q4=hottest). Mean minutes of neighborhood walking per day was
186 calculated by redlining score and LST z-score quartile. We tested differences in sample
187 characteristics and minutes of neighborhood walking by LST quartile and redlining score using
188 unadjusted ordinal logistic regression and linear regression.

189

190 Multivariable negative binomial regression models, accounting for clustering of participants
191 within households and within census tracts, tested associations between LST z-score and
192 neighborhood walking minutes/day. Negative binomial regression accounted for zero
193 inflated/skewed data (model fit confirmed via Pearson χ^2 goodness-of-fit test). The models
194 controlled for age, sex, education, income, race/ethnicity, and state of residence. Regression
195 estimates were exponentiated to determine prevalence ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI).
196 The models were repeated after stratifying by historic redlining score ("definitely declining" or
197 "hazardous" versus "still desirable" or "best") to assess whether individuals in neighborhoods
198 with both discriminatory historic redlining scores and greater LST demonstrate the least amount

199 of neighborhood walking/day. Lastly, a linear regression model that controlled for state of
200 residence and used generalized estimating equations to account for clustering by household
201 tested the association between living in a neighborhood with a redline score of "definitely
202 declining" or "hazardous" (versus "still desirable" or "best") and LST z-score. All analyses were
203 conducted in SAS v9.4.

204

205 **Results**

206 The analytic sample (n=3,982) was on average 73 years old (SD=7.2), 55.1% were women, and
207 70.2% had at least some college education (Table 1). Seventy-eight percent were non-Hispanic
208 White, 10% were African American/Black, 7% were Hispanic, 3% were Asian, and 2% were of
209 another race/ethnicity. Hispanic and Asian individuals and those with annual household incomes
210 >\$125,000/year were less frequently living in neighborhoods with higher peak summer LSTs.

211 [Insert Table 1 here]

212 Figure 1 depicts the variation in peak summer LST across the US in 2013. Individuals living in
213 the South and West but not the Northeast and Midwest were more likely to live in neighborhoods
214 with lower peak summer LSTs (Table 2). Individuals in neighborhoods with higher area
215 deprivation index scores and greater neighborhood percentage of African American/Black
216 residents were more likely to experience higher peak summer LSTs. Individuals living in
217 neighborhoods with redlining scores of "best" were more likely to live in areas with lower peak
218 summer LSTs.

219 [Insert Figure 1 here]

220 [Insert Table 2 here]

221 Older adults living in neighborhoods with historic redlining scores of "still desirable", "definitely
222 declining" or "hazardous" reported fewer minutes of neighborhood walking/day compared to
223 those in neighborhoods with historic redlining scores of "best" (Table 3). Compared to
224 individuals living in neighborhoods at the bottom quartile of peak summer LSTs, those in the top
225 quartile walked significantly fewer minutes in the neighborhood per day.

226 [Insert Table 3 here]

227 In multivariable regression analyses, older adults living in neighborhoods with higher peak
228 summer LST z-scores reported fewer minutes of neighborhood walking/day (Table 4) (PR: 0.85,
229 95% CI: 0.74-0.98). Stratifying by redlining score showed no significant associations between
230 LST z-score and neighborhood walking in separately for those living in neighborhoods with
231 redlining scores of "definitely declining" or "hazardous" (PR: 0.99, 95% CI: 0.82-1.21) or for
232 those living in neighborhoods scored as "still desirable" and "best" (PR: 0.77, 95% CI: 0.58-
233 1.01). However, the latter association was borderline significant at $p=0.059$. Lastly,
234 neighborhood redlining scores of "definitely declining" or "hazardous" (versus "still desirable"
235 and "best") were associated with greater neighborhood peak LSTs (Table 5) (estimate: 0.103,
236 95% CI: 0.009-0.198).

237 [Insert Table 4 here]

238 [Insert Table 5 here]

239

240 **Discussion**

241 The number of empirical studies on the relationship between the historical policies of housing
242 discrimination, urban greenspace availability, and exposure to urban heat anomalies in
243 economically disadvantaged communities of color continues to grow, revealing consistent patterns

244 of inequality.²⁸⁻³¹ However, despite the attention given to the urban heat island effect and its
245 implications for human health and well-being in recent years, relatively few studies have
246 specifically addressed the exposure of older adults to peak summer LSTs in historically redlined
247 neighborhoods and the extent to which this exposure affects daily physical activity. This study
248 attempts to fill these knowledge gaps by leveraging data from travel diaries on daily walking trips,
249 peak summer LSTs, neighborhood characteristics, and the historical legacy of residential
250 segregation to assess the physical activity patterns of 3,982 adults 65 years and older.

251
252 We found evidence of significant peak summer warming in census tracts with higher area
253 deprivation index scores. Heat exposure variation was also observed in relation to the
254 neighborhoods' racial and ethnic composition. A higher heat risk burden was associated with
255 communities characterized by a larger percentage of African American/Black residents. We found
256 that lower-income, Asian, and Hispanic individuals were more likely to live in neighborhoods with
257 higher peak summertime LST compared to White and higher-income residents. These outcomes
258 corroborate the results of previous studies, which consistently found evidence of urban heat
259 exposure disparities associated with income and race/ethnicity.^{20,28}

260
261 Several recent studies highlighted the legacy of institutionalized residential segregation after the
262 Great Depression and the impact of systematic targeting of communities of color, which ultimately
263 led to disinvestment and profound socio-economic inequalities.^{29,30} We observed a greater
264 neighborhood peak summertime LSTs in neighborhoods with redlining scores of "definitely
265 declining" or "hazardous" (versus "still desirable" and "best"). Our findings confirm the results
266 from previous studies. For example, Li et al. observed that the proportion of redlined areas is a

267 significant predictor of both daytime and nighttime LST.³⁰ We also found that older adults reported
268 fewer minutes of walking in historically redlined neighborhoods with Home Owners' Loan
269 Corporation (HOLC) scores of "definitely declining" and "hazardous."

270 Several limitations of this study warrant further consideration. Landsat data has a repeat interval
271 of approximately two weeks (with no more than two observations in any given month). Extensive
272 cloud cover, typical for wet summer months in certain regions, may obstruct the usability of
273 Landsat data for extended periods of time.²⁹ To address this limitation, this study used aggregated
274 daytime maximum LST data for a 40-day timespan from July to August 2013. Previous studies
275 have also highlighted the fact that LST, as a proxy of thermal exposure, may not fully capture the
276 heat stress experienced by individuals.^{18,30} These limitations suggest that more complex modeling
277 of urban microclimates that takes into account both LST and air temperature, as well as the cooling
278 effects of urban blue-green infrastructure, may improve our understanding of urban heat exposure.

279
280 Our results suggest that the association between higher neighborhood LSTs and less neighborhood
281 walking might be restricted to older adults living in neighborhoods with historic redlining scores
282 of "still desirable" or "best" (i.e., advantaged communities). Prior work has demonstrated that
283 historically redlined neighborhoods remain more economically deprived, less walkable, have more
284 less greenspace and tree canopy, and have greater concentrations of African American/Black and
285 Hispanic/LatinX residents.³¹ Conversely, neighborhoods with historic redlining scores of "still
286 desirable" and "best" have built and social environments today that are more conducive to
287 neighborhood walking (i.e., higher SES, more greenspace, more pedestrian amenities and
288 destinations). Yet, we found that individuals in those more affluent neighborhoods walk less if
289 their neighborhoods experience higher LSTs. This may be explained by the lack of transportation

290 options and other sources of recreational physical activity for older adults living in more
291 disadvantaged communities that were historically redlined, and thus their neighborhood walking
292 does not decrease with higher neighborhood LSTs. Older adults in more affluent communities are
293 more likely to have alternative sources of transportation to nearby destinations other than walking,
294 as well as other places and opportunities for exercise other than neighborhood walking³⁸, and thus
295 may be more likely to decrease neighborhood walking with increasing temperatures. If these
296 findings are replicated in other studies, this suggests an even more pressing need to address urban
297 heat islands in historically disadvantaged communities because older adults (who are more
298 susceptible to heat) in these communities are more likely to be exposed to extreme heat in their
299 neighborhoods and experience negative health effects (e.g., heat stroke and cardiorespiratory
300 symptoms).³⁹

301

302 **Conclusion**

303 Overall, this study suggests that historically redlined neighborhoods may more often experience
304 urban heat island effects and that older adults living in hotter neighborhoods may less often
305 engage in neighborhood walking. Discriminatory policies such as historic redlining have left
306 indelible marks on neighborhoods across the US, leaving communities more vulnerable to
307 detrimental environmental exposures, including extreme heat. Future work is needed to elucidate
308 the impact of extreme heat on health-promoting behaviors such as neighborhood walking and the
309 types of interventions and policies that can successfully counteract the negative health impacts of
310 extreme heat on these historically disadvantaged communities.

311

312 **References**

- 313 1. Ungvari Z, Fazekas-Pongor V, Csiszar A, Kunutsor SK. The multifaceted benefits of
314 walking for healthy aging: from Blue Zones to molecular mechanisms. *Geroscience*. Dec
315 2023;45(6):3211-3239. doi:10.1007/s11357-023-00873-8
- 316 2. Lee LL, Mulvaney CA, Wong YKY, Chan ESY, Watson MC, Lin HH. Walking for
317 hypertension. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev*. 2021;(2)doi:ARTN CD008823
318 10.1002/14651858.CD008823.pub2
- 319 3. Ma D, Wu L, He Z. Effects of walking on the preservation of bone mineral density in
320 perimenopausal and postmenopausal women: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
321 *Menopause*. Nov 2013;20(11):1216-26. doi:10.1097/GME.000000000000100
- 322 4. Schuch FB, Vancampfort D, Firth J, et al. Physical Activity and Incident Depression: A
323 Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Am J Psychiatry*. Jul 1 2018;175(7):631-
324 648. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17111194
- 325 5. Pearce M, Garcia L, Abbas A, et al. Association Between Physical Activity and Risk of
326 Depression A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Jama Psychiat*. Jun 2022;79(6):550-
327 559. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.0609
- 328 6. Mehra S, Dadema T, Krose BJ, et al. Attitudes of Older Adults in a Group-Based Exercise
329 Program Toward a Blended Intervention; A Focus-Group Study. *Front Psychol*.
330 2016;7:1827. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01827
- 331 7. Rodríguez DA, Evenson KR, Roux AVD, Brines SJ. Land Use, Residential Density, and
332 Walking The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *Am J Prev Med*. Nov
333 2009;37(5):397-404. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.07.008

- 334 8. Troped PJ, Wilson JS, Matthews CE, Cromley EK, Melly SJ. The built environment and
335 location-based physical activity. *Am J Prev Med.* Apr 2010;38(4):429-38.
336 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.12.032
- 337 9. Lee IM, Ewing R, Sesso HD. The built environment and physical activity levels: the
338 Harvard Alumni Health Study. *Am J Prev Med.* Oct 2009;37(4):293-8.
339 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.007
- 340 10. Chaix B, Simon C, Charreire H, et al. The environmental correlates of overall and
341 neighborhood based recreational walking (a cross-sectional analysis of the RECORD
342 Study). *Int J Behav Nutr Phy.* Feb 21 2014;11doi:Artn 20
343 10.1186/1479-5868-11-20
- 344 11. Tcymbal A, Demetriou Y, Kelso A, et al. Effects of the built environment on physical
345 activity: a systematic review of longitudinal studies taking sex/gender into account.
346 *Environ Health Prev.* Dec 2020;25(1)doi:ARTN 75
347 10.1186/s12199-020-00915-z
- 348 12. McDonald RI, Biswas T, Sachar C, et al. The tree cover and temperature disparity in US
349 urbanized areas: Quantifying the association with income across 5,723 communities. *PLoS*
350 *One.* 2021;16(4):e0249715. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0249715
- 351 13. Besser LM, Mitsova DP. Neighborhood Green Land Cover and Neighborhood-Based
352 Walking in U.S. Older Adults. *Am J Prev Med.* Jul 2021;61(1):e13-e20.
353 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2021.01.013
- 354 14. Besser LM, Pescador Jimenez, M., Reimer, C., Adkins-Jackson, P.A.J., George, K.M.,
355 Meyer, O.L., Mitsova, D., and Galvin, J.E. Association between neighborhood greenspace
356 and brain health by racialized/ ethnic group: A rapid review. *International Journal of*

- 357 *Environmental Research and Public Health*.
358 2023;20(9)(5666)doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20095666>
- 359 15. Knight T, Price S, Bowler D, et al. How effective is 'greening' of urban areas in reducing
360 human exposure to ground-level ozone concentrations, UV exposure and the 'urban heat
361 island effect'? An updated systematic review. *Environ Evid*. Jun 5 2021;10(1)doi:ARTN
362 1210.1186/s13750-021-00226-y
- 363 16. Mitchell BC, Chakraborty J. Landscapes of thermal inequity: disproportionate exposure to
364 urban heat in the three largest US cities. *Environ Res Lett*. Nov 2015;10(11)doi:Artn
365 11500510.1088/1748-9326/10/11/115005
- 366 17. Nesbitt L, Meitner MJ, Girling C, Sheppard SRJ, Lu YH. Who has access to urban
367 vegetation? A spatial analysis of distributional green equity in 10 US cities. *Landscape
368 Urban Plan*. Jan 2019;181:51-79. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.08.007
- 369 18. Chakraborty T, Hsu A, Manya D, Sheriff G. Disproportionately higher exposure to urban
370 heat in lower-income neighborhoods: a multi-city perspective. *Environ Res Lett*. Oct
371 2019;14(10)doi:ARTN 10500310.1088/1748-9326/ab3b99
- 372 19. Eanes AM, Lookingbill TR, Hoffman JS, Saverino KC, Fong SS. Assessing Inequitable
373 Urban Heat Islands and Air Pollution Disparities with Low-Cost Sensors in Richmond,
374 Virginia. *Sustainability-Basel*. Dec 2020;12(23)doi:ARTN 1008910.3390/su122310089
- 375 20. Benz SA, Burney JA. Widespread Race and Class Disparities in Surface Urban Heat
376 Extremes Across the United States. *Earths Future*. Jul
377 2021;9(7)doi:ARTN2021EF00201610.1029/2021EF002016

- 378 21. Hsu A, Sheriff G, Chakraborty T, Manya D. Publisher Correction: Disproportionate
379 exposure to urban heat island intensity across major US cities. *Nat Commun.* Jun 28
380 2021;12(1):4104. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-23972-6
- 381 22. Oke TR, Zeuner G, Jauregui E. The Surface-Energy Balance in Mexico-City. *Atmos*
382 *Environ B-Urb.* Dec 1992;26(4):433-444. doi:Doi 10.1016/0957-1272(92)90050-3
- 383 23. Voelkel J, Hellman D, Sakuma R, Shandas V. Assessing Vulnerability to Urban Heat: A
384 Study of Disproportionate Heat Exposure and Access to Refuge by Socio-Demographic
385 Status in Portland, Oregon. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* Mar 30
386 2018;15(4)doi:10.3390/ijerph15040640
- 387 24. Voogt JA, Oke TR. Thermal remote sensing of urban climates. *Remote Sensing of*
388 *Environment.* Aug 15 2003;86(3):370-384. doi:10.1016/S0034-4257(03)00079-8
- 389 25. Ernest S, Nduganda, A. and Kashaigili, J. Urban Climate Analysis with Remote Sensing
390 and Climate Observations: A Case of Morogoro Municipality in Tanzania. *Advances in*
391 *Remote Sensing.* 2017;6:120-131. doi:10.4236/ars.2017.62009
- 392 26. Xu X, Pei H, Wang C, et al. Long-term analysis of the urban heat island effect using
393 multisource Landsat images considering inter-class differences in land surface temperature
394 products. *Sci Total Environ.* Feb 1 2023;858(Pt 1):159777.
395 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.159777
- 396 27. Klinenberg E. Review of heat wave: social autopsy of disaster in Chicago. *N Engl J Med.*
397 Feb 13 2003;348(7):666-7. doi:10.1056/NEJM200302133480721
- 398 28. Hoffman JS, Shandas V, Pendleton N. The Effects of Historical Housing Policies on
399 Resident Exposure to Intra-Urban Heat: A Study of 108 US Urban Areas. *Climate.* Jan
400 2020;8(1):12.

- 401 29. Wilson B. Urban Heat Management and the Legacy of Redlining. *J Am Plann Assoc.* Oct
402 1 2020;86(4):443-457. doi:10.1080/01944363.2020.1759127
- 403 30. Li DY, Newman GD, Wilson B, Zhang Y, Brown RD. Modeling the relationships
404 between historical redlining, urban heat, and heat-related emergency department visits: An
405 examination of 11 Texas cities. *Environ Plan B-Urban.* Mar 2022;49(3):933-952.
- 406 31. Besser LM, Mitsova D, Williams CL, Wiese L. Redlining and Neighborhood Walking in
407 Older Adults: The 2017 National Household Travel Survey. *Am J Prev Med.* Dec
408 2022;63(6):926-934. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2022.06.010
- 409 32. Meier Helen C.S. aMBC. Data from: Historic Redlining Scores for 2010 and 2020 US
410 Census Tracts: Historic Redlining Score 2010B. 2021. doi:10.18128/D050.V14.0
- 411 33. University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health. 2015. Accessed 9/3/2020,
412 <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>
- 413 34. Manson S SJ, Van Riper D, Ruggles S. Data from: IPUMS National Historical
414 Geographic Information System. 2019;Version 14.0 doi:10.18128/D050.V14.0
- 415 35. Wickham J, Homer C, Vogelmann J, et al. The Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics
416 (MRLC) Consortium-20 Years of Development and Integration of USA National Land
417 Cover Data. *Remote Sens-Basel.* Aug 2014;6(8):7424-7441. doi:10.3390/rs6087424
- 418 36. Wickham J, Stehman SV, Gass L, et al. Thematic accuracy assessment of the 2011
419 National Land Cover Database (NLCD). *Remote Sens Environ.* 2017;191:328-341.
420 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.026
- 421 37. Besser L, Chang L-C, Kluttz J. Individual and neighborhood characteristics associated
422 with neighborhood walking among US older adults. *Preventive Medicine Reports.* 2020;

- 423 38. Procter-Gray E, Leveille SG, Hannan MT, Cheng J, Kane K, Li W. Variations in
424 Community Prevalence and Determinants of Recreational and Utilitarian Walking in
425 Older Age. *J Aging Res.* 2015;2015:382703. doi:10.1155/2015/382703
- 426 39. Faurie C, Varghese BM, Liu JW, Bi P. Association between high temperature and
427 heatwaves with heat-related illnesses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Science of*
428 *the Total Environment.* Dec 15 2022;852doi:ARTN
429 15833210.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158332
- 430




Figure 1. Averages Land Surface temperature for a 40-day timespan from July to August 2013 (*Data Source:* Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN))

Table 1. Sample demographics by neighborhood land surface temperature

| Characteristic | Neighborhood peak summer LST z-score | | | | | p-value ^a |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|
| | Total sample | Q1 (coolest) | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 (hottest) | |
| | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | |
| Sample, n | 3982 | 992 | 998 | 994 | 998 | N/A |
| Age group | | | | | | |
| 65-69 years old | 1585 (39.8%) | 385 (38.8%) | 403 (40.4%) | 389 (39.1%) | 408 (40.9%) | Ref. |
| 70-74 years old | 989 (24.8%) | 260 (26.2%) | 246 (24.7%) | 243 (24.5%) | 240 (24.1%) | 0.28 |
| 75-79 years old | 615 (15.4%) | 167 (16.8%) | 157 (15.7%) | 146 (14.7%) | 145 (14.5%) | 0.13 |
| 80 and older | 793 (19.9%) | 180 (18.2%) | 192 (19.2%) | 216 (21.7%) | 205 (20.5%) | 0.36 |
| Male | 1787 (44.9%) | 440 (44.4%) | 458 (45.9%) | 443 (44.6%) | 446 (44.7%) | 0.96 |
| Education level | | | | | | |
| <HS degree | 294 (7.4%) | 76 (7.7%) | 98 (9.8%) | 53 (5.3%) | 67 (6.7%) | Ref. |
| High school degree | 895 (22.5%) | 130 (13.1%) | 213 (21.4%) | 255 (25.7%) | 297 (29.8%) | <.0001 |
| Some college | 998 (25.1%) | 220 (22.2%) | 228 (22.9%) | 281 (28.3%) | 269 (27.0%) | <.0001 |
| Bachelor's degree | 727 (18.3%) | 202 (20.4%) | 195 (19.6%) | 188 (18.9%) | 142 (14.2%) | <.0001 |
| Graduate/professional degree | 1064 (26.8%) | 363 (36.6%) | 262 (26.3%) | 217 (21.8%) | 222 (22.3%) | 0.12 |
| Annual household income | | | | | | |
| 0-34,999 | 1414 (37.5%) | 300 (31.5%) | 326 (34.4%) | 376 (40.4%) | 412 (43.9%) | Ref. |
| 35,000-74,999 | 1130 (30.0%) | 242 (25.4%) | 268 (28.3%) | 304 (32.7%) | 316 (33.7%) | 0.60 |
| 75,000-125,000 | 686 (18.2%) | 169 (17.7%) | 203 (21.4%) | 172 (18.5%) | 142 (15.1%) | <.0001 |
| >125,000 | 540 (14.3%) | 243 (25.5%) | 151 (15.9%) | 78 (8.4%) | 68 (7.3%) | <.0001 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic White | 3070 (77.5%) | 653 (66.3%) | 725 (72.9%) | 853 (85.9%) | 839 (84.9%) | Ref. |
| African American/Black ^b | 394 (10.0%) | 89 (9.0%) | 101 (10.2%) | 99 (10.0%) | 105 (10.6%) | 0.36 |
| Hispanic | 280 (7.1%) | 130 (13.2%) | 120 (12.1%) | 16 (1.6%) | 14 (1.4%) | <.0001 |
| Asian | 131 (3.3%) | 89 (9.0%) | 26 (2.6%) | 8 (0.8%) | 8 (0.8%) | <.0001 |
| Other | 85 (2.2%) | 24 (2.4%) | 22 (2.2%) | 17 (1.7%) | 22 (2.2%) | 0.13 |

Abbreviation: LST = land surface temperature; Q1 to Q4 = Quartile 1 to Quartile 4; Ref=reference group; ^a Unadjusted ordinal logistic regression; ^b Includes Hispanic

Table 2. Sample neighborhood characteristics by neighborhood land surface temperature

| Neighborhood characteristic | Total | Neighborhood peak summer LST z-score | | | | p-value ^a |
|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| | | Q1 (coolest) | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 (hottest) | |
| Census region, n (%) | | | | | | |
| Northeast | 1268 (31.8%) | 34 (3.4%) | 330 (33.1%) | 427 (43.0%) | 477 (47.8%) | Ref. |
| Midwest | 1095 (27.5%) | 80 (8.1%) | 197 (19.7%) | 445 (44.8%) | 373 (37.4%) | 0.40 |
| South | 733 (18.4%) | 197 (19.9%) | 291 (29.2%) | 101 (10.2%) | 144 (14.4%) | <.0001 |
| West | 886 (22.3%) | 681 (68.7%) | 180 (18.0%) | 21 (2.1%) | 4 (0.4%) | <.0001 |
| Population density (people/mile ²), n (%) | | | | | | |
| 0-3,999 | 1127 (28.3%) | 183 (18.5%) | 280 (28.1%) | 315 (31.7%) | 349 (35.0%) | Ref. |
| 4,000-9,999 | 1880 (47.2%) | 428 (43.2%) | 459 (46.0%) | 481 (48.4%) | 512 (51.3%) | 0.0001 |
| ≥10,000 | 975 (24.5%) | 381 (38.4%) | 259 (26.0%) | 198 (19.9%) | 137 (13.7%) | <.0001 |
| Area deprivation index, mean (SD) | 27.5 (38.1) | 10.8 (28.2) | 24.7 (37.2) | 30.8 (38.2) | 43.8 (40.2) | <.0001 |
| % greenspace, mean (SD) | 3.2% (6.5) | 3.3% (0.8) | 2.9% (6.4) | 3.9% (6.8) | 2.5% (4.7) | 0.10 |
| % African American/Black, mean (SD) | 14.7% (20.2) | 9.0% (13.5) | 13.5% (19.2) | 17.8% (24.5) | 18.6% (20.7) | <.0001 |
| % Hispanic/LatinX, mean (SD) | 16.9% (21.1) | 25.2% (23.9) | 23.7% (26.5) | 9.1% (11.5) | 9.4% (12.2) | <.0001 |
| Redlining score, n (%) | | | | | | |
| “Best” | 651 (16.4%) | 219 (22.1%) | 280 (28.1%) | 125 (12.6%) | 112 (11.2%) | Ref. |
| “Still desirable” | 1027 (25.8%) | 259 (26.1%) | 216 (21.6%) | 269 (27.1%) | 283 (28.4%) | <.0001 |
| “Definitely declining” | 1574 (39.5%) | 356 (35.9%) | 379 (38.0%) | 414 (41.7%) | 425 (42.6%) | <.0001 |
| “Hazardous” | 730 (18.3%) | 158 (15.9%) | 208 (20.8%) | 186 (18.7%) | 178 (17.8%) | <.0001 |

Abbreviation: LST = land surface temperature; Q1 to Q4 = Quartile 1 to Quartile 4; Ref=reference group; ^a Unadjusted ordinal logistic regression

Table 3. Minutes of neighborhood walking by redlining score and neighborhood summer peak land surface temperature

| Characteristic | Neighborhood redlining score | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | Overall sample | “Best” | “Still desirable” | “Definitely declining” | “Hazardous” |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| All participants | 6.4 (19.5) | 8.5 (26.0) | 6.5 (18.1)* | 5.7 (17.5)* | 5.9 (18.6)* |
| Neighborhood peak summer LST z-score | | | | | |
| Q1 (coolest) | 7.7 (20.4) | 10.0 (27.1) | 7.4 (17.6) | 6.6 (18.0) | 7.3 (18.8) |
| Q2 | 6.3 (18.0) | 8.3 (24.4) | 5.7 (14.5) | 5.1 (14.1)* | 7.1 (20.4) |
| Q3 | 6.4 (21.5) | 10.7 (31.2) | 7.7 (23.4) | 5.1 (17.5)* | 4.9 (18.3)* |
| Q4 (hottest) | 5.3 (17.9)** | 3.6 (18.8)** | 5.3 (15.2) | 6.0 (19.8) | 4.5 (16.3) |

Abbreviation: LST = land surface temperature; Q1 to Q4 = Quartile 1 to Quartile 4; SD=standard deviation

* significantly different than neighborhoods scored as “best” in same row at $p < 0.05$ (unadjusted linear regression with walking minutes as outcome and redlining score as predictor); ** $p < 0.05$ for association between categorical LST z-score and minutes of neighborhood walking (unadjusted ordinal logistic regression)

Table 4. Association between neighborhood summer peak land surface temperature and minutes of neighborhood walking per day

| Model | PR ^a | (95% CI) | p-value |
|--|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| Overall sample | 0.85 | 0.74-0.98 | 0.02 |
| Neighborhood had historic redlining score of “Definitely Declining” or “Hazardous” | 0.99 | 0.82-1.21 | 0.95 |
| Neighborhood had historic redlining score of “Still Desirable” or “Best” | 0.77 | 0.58-1.01 | 0.059 |

^a Controlling for age, sex, education, income, race/ethnicity, state

Table 5. Association between dichotomous neighborhood redlining score and Neighborhood peak summer land surface temperature

| Variable | Estimate (95% CI) ^a | p-value |
|---|--------------------------------|---------|
| Neighborhood scored as “definitely declining” or hazardous ^b | 0.103 (0.009-0.198) | 0.03 |

^a Controlled for state of residence

^b versus “still desirable” or “best”