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Despite growing concerns regarding deteriorating conditions of transportation, and the dire need for more transportation in the urban community the government keeps refusing to fund for mass transit

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Ware Professor of Sociology and the director of the Environmental Justice resources at Clark Atlanta University, “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism and New Routes To Equality: Building Transportation Equity into Smart Growth” 179-82)

Unfortunately, when any people think of public transit they think of rickety, smelly diesel buses crowded with poor people. To them, public transit if for losers. On the other hand, thinking about suburbanites, or “choice riders” as they are called by transit planners, getting out of their cars and into public transit, calls to mind a different image: brand-new buses or rail cars equipped with reclining seats, reading lights, and, of course, air conditioning. These perceptions are not too far from reality. Transportation dollars follow power, and power is not in the hands of the poor. In fact, the radically disparate spending of tax dollars has affected land-use decisions nationwide and subsidized the uneven development between central cities and suburbs-literally laying the pavement for suburban sprawl. Highway funding is the federal government’s “hidden urban policy program”. Buttressing the asphalt and construction industry, state departments of transportation (DOTs) are basically road building programs that respond to the highway lobby, a lobby that fills the coffers of many politicians. Few could argue that transportation dollars are dispensed on a level playing field. While political leaders would never think of cutting off their “pork barrel” home-district road-building programs, efficient, clean urban mass transportation systems have few powerful lobbies or political allies. Transportation decision-making-often mirrors the power arrangements of the dominant society and its institutions. Money and political power have shifted to the suburbs, in general, suburban America gets what it wants. Affluent suburbanites do not want inner-city bus riders “invading” their communities. Bus riders are equated with crime, drugs, and other “undesirable” elements. Although there is little or no empirical evidence to support these stereotypes, they linger anyway and influence people’s beliefs, including those of some planners, and about regional transit. Numerous examples abound in which government subsidies target suburban regions for infrastructure improvements and amenities such as water irrigation systems, ship channels, road and bridge projects, as even shopping malls, while neglecting urban development. For example, the Georgia Department of Transportation committed $46 million in taxpayer money to make Gwinnett County’s “Mall of Georgia” possible. The 1.7 million-square-foot, 100-acre mall, located in Atlanta’s northern suburbs, opened in the fall of 1999 with parking spaces for 8600 cars and no transit access. As black Americans moved to the cities, millions of white Americans voted with their feet, moving to the ‘burbs, shifting political power. In 1960, sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan, in his article “New Roads to Chaos,” predicted many of the urban problems we are grappling with today. Moynihan wrote: It is becoming increasingly obvious that American government, both national and local, can no longer ignore what is happening as the suburb set endlessly into the countryside. Since the spreading pollution of land follows the roads, those who build the roads must also recognize the responsibility of the consequences. Thirty years later 1990, US Senator Moynihan, as Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Transportation, became the chief architect of the groundbreaking Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA attempted to change the way transportation planning was conducted and how resources were allocated. ISTEA recognized that central cities and suburbs are not equal and often compete for scarce resources. One need not be a rocket scientist to predict the outcome of a competition between affluent suburbs and their less affluent central-city competitors. Megabucks are spent on freeways to move suburbanite around, white central-city residents fight for pennies to keep transit services running and fares affordable. These problems appear to be more severe in urban areas with large concentrations of poor people and people of color. Highways are the lifelines for suburban commuters- connecting them to home, work, shopping, recreation, and other activities. Millions of central-city residents have no options except public transit. Transit providers know this and are not inclined to pamper their low-income, people of color, urban transit-dependent riders as they do their white suburban “choice riders.” These double standards persist in the face of budget shortfalls and service cuts. Recent cuts in mass transit subsidies and fare hikes have restricted access to essential social services and economic activities. The money spend on building roads is more about mobility for the rich than equity for all. More roads on the urban edge translate into more cars and more land-use patterns that can only be served by highways. Sprawl- driven transportation also fuels political campaign contributions for those elected officials who promote sprawl as “good business”. Economic development policies flow from forces of production and are often dominated by federal, state, and local government actors. The absence of a coherent urban agenda in the 1990s allowed many of our cities to become forgotten and invisible places. The quality of life for millions of urban Americans is worse today than it was during the turbulent 1960s. a 1999 *USA Today* survey of experts singled out “wealth disparity” as the biggest issue in cities’ development for the next fifty years. The growing economic disparity between racial and ethnic groups as compared to whites has a direct correlation to the institutional barriers in housing, leading, employment, education, health, and transportation. A 1999 headline-grabbing story in *USA Today* reported that “traffic is worse than ever” and that “congestion on US roads is outpacing population growth”. While the nation’s largest metropolitan areas grew by 22 percent over the past fifteen years, congestion grew by a staggering 235 percent. Daily congestion on the nation’s highways continues to plague most cities across the country. The *2002 Urban Mobility Study* from the Texas Transportation Institute revealed that for peak-period travelers the time penalty for traveling during rush-hour jumped from 16 hours per year in 1982 to 62 hours in 2000. The study also found that congestion on the roads during rush hours had increased form 4.5 hours a day in 1982 to 7 hours in 2000 in seventy-five US cities. In addition to more cars on the road, people are driving more miles and using more gas. According to the Federal Highway Admission (FHWA) report, *Highway Statistics,* total vehicle miles traveled in the United States increased by 59 percent form 1980 to 1995. On fuel alone, American drivers spend over $67.5 billion in 2000, about $1160 per person. Approximately 5.7 billion gallons of fuel are wasted in the seventy-five urban areas each year. That equates to about 99 gallons of fuel used per person each year. A 2001 Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP) and Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) report, *Driver to Spend,* found that sprawl drivers up transportation costs for American families. The study government data on consumer expenditures ranking twenty- eight major metro areas by the portion of the family budget devoted to daily transportation costs, and discovered that the metropolitan areas where transportation takes the biggest bite out of the household budget are Huston, Atlanta Dallas-Fort Worth, Miami, and Detroit. The average Houstonian used 22 cents out of every dollar spend on transportation-or $8840 each year on transportation. Essentially, heavy government investment in the road infrastructure is contributing to an increase in household transportation cost. This is especially harmful to low-income households- especially African Americans and Latinos, who are disproportionately represented in the lower income category-who spend more of their income on transportation costs than whites.

This refusal has lead to the rise of the automobile industry and development of new freeways. These developments uniquely hurt the people living in urban communities as their homes are deteriorated and used as dumping sites. This is a form of environmental injustice and racism that only affects the urban communities.

**Sanchez at al 03**

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Transportation policies and practices of locating freeway projects in minority neighborhoods have, in a number of cases, impeded the ability of minorities to access housing. Although there are no empirical data on the number of communities or people affected or the extent of the impact, historical and current examples of disproportionate impacts of transportation projects on minority neighborhoods exist and are discussed in this section. Freeway placements and expansions in urban areas typically occur where land prices are depressed—which frequently corresponds with the residential neighborhoods of low-income and minority households. Such neighborhoods generally have low levels of political power resulting from institutional discrimination over time. In some respects, freeway locations in cities are the philosophical progeny of “Negro removal” or “urban renewal” programs that were thought to cure “urban blight” by tearing down minorities’ homes.116 Some freeway construction projects have destroyed thousands of residential units occupied by minority and low-income households. In some cases, community objections to proposed projects have prevented widespread displacement and other inequitable effects. For example, in 1972, individuals and organizations concerned about people who would be displaced by the proposed I-105 “Century Freeway” construction in Los Angeles brought a lawsuit against state and federal government officials seeking injunctive relief. In 1982, the U.S. District Court approved a final consent decree requiring the state and federal defendants to provide 3,700 units of decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing to residents who were displaced by the freeway Another example is the proposed extension to the Long Beach Freeway (710) in California. In 1994, the original proposal to extend the freeway provided more measures to lessen the impact of the proposed freeway in the predominantly white communities of South Pasadena and Pasadena and fewer measures in El Sereno, an almost completely Latino neighborhood in east Los Angeles.118 The original plan was to place mostly below-grade freeways in Pasadena and South Pasadena, but not in El Sereno. Also, it would have built five tunnel sections in Pasadena and South Pasadena to “mitigate the perception of a divided neighborhood” and only one tunnel in El Sereno (including a tunnel near the South Pasadena High School, but not one near the Sierra Vista Elementary School in El Sereno). Community members objected to the extension as proposed and, through a lawsuit, were able to make the project more equitable. In addition to destroying thriving neighborhoods, some freeway construction has posed physical hazards to the minorities and low-income individuals living near them. In Miami–Dade County, Florida, community residents remember well the detrimental impact that the construction of Interstate 95 had on vibrant African-American communities and business districts in the 1950s and 1960s. The decision to widen I-95 in the 1990s exacerbated the negative impact of the highway on local residents. Not only had the community never recovered from the original highway construction—the neighborhood’s property values had declined significantly over the past couple of decades as blight crept into the community—but the highway is within feet of residents’ houses. The only barrier protecting homes from the noise, vibration, and danger of potential accidents was a wire fence. On several occasions, local residents reported cars, tires, and other debris flying into their yards from the freeway, and many residents were afraid to be in the rear of their houses for fear of their lives.119 Local residents, who were predominantly minority and low to middle income, argued that the placement of the freeway and the proposed expansion was a clear case of discrimination and environmental injustice. Their accusations were further supported by the observation that other stretches of I-95 in Miami–Dade County in areas that were typically affluent and less likely to be predominantly minority had well-built and sturdy sound mitigation walls protecting property from the highway. In response to the residents’ concerns and allegations of discrimination, Florida officials quickly pulled together the financial resources to build a mitigation wall.120 Another current example of how transportation decisions can have a negative impact on a minority community is the controversy over a proposed major road that threatens to destroy a sacred American Indian site just outside of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Community leaders there are struggling to protect the Petroglyphs, a place for prayer and culture for the many Native American tribes (primarily Pueblo Indian tribes) in that region of the country. Despite its designation as a national park in 1998, developers and local politicians have repeatedly attempted to build roads through the park to facilitate access to new suburban growth farther out into the areas around Albuquerque. Through political and community organizing and legal advocacy, the Sacred Alliances for Grassroots Equality Council has succeeded in slowing efforts to develop portions of the Petroglyph National Park. Whether they will be able to prevent completely road construction through the Petroglyphs remains in question because powerful interests continue to advocate for road construction.121 Although proposed road projects would not destroy the community in which the Native Americans reside, they would be just as harmful because they would destroy a sacred site that is an integral part of their sense of community. In other large construction projects—such as I-670 in Columbus, Ohio; I-94 in Detroit; I- 5 in Portland, Oregon; and I-43 in Milwaukee—anecdotal evidence suggests that minority and low-income communities have been unable to prevent large numbers of individuals from being displaced, and the resulting disintegration of their communities.

We’ll Isolate 3 Internal Links

1. Lack of Public Transportation constrains students from attending school, which disincentives them from pursuing higher education

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Although the large majority of K–12 students do not need to rely on public transit to get to school, for those who do, access to that transportation may mean the difference between attending and missing school. For instance, during efforts to obtain free student transit passes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission serving the San Francisco Bay area, evidence was presented that students without access to public transportation would not attend school.133 A number of high school students in Oakland and El Cerrito, which have significant minority populations, testified that they needed free transit passes because their families sometimes had to decide between food and bus fare.134 In Portland, Oregon, the school district does not provide bus service for students living within 1.5 miles of a school. Sisters in Action for Power, an organization focusing on the interests of low-income girls and girls of color, pressed for free rides to high school on public buses after its survey of more than 2,000 students found that 11 percent reported missing school due to their inability to meet transportation costs.135 Students in Providence, Rhode Island, in an informal survey of more than 500 high school students, found that a number of students whose families were unable to afford bus passes stayed home and missed school, especially during harsh winter days, and others got detention for being late because of the amount of time it took them to walk to school.136 Currently, students attending Providence public high schools who live within three miles of their school must walk or provide their own means of transportation. Limited funding for schools makes it difficult for school districts to transport all children in school buses. Recent severe cuts in school budgets makes it likely that more school districts will need to reduce the transportation services they provide and that more children will need to rely on public transportation to attend school. Transportation policies should recognize and address this growing need. In addition, education reform laws do not always consider the impact of access to transportation. For example, states authorizing charter schools do not always require that the schools provide transportation to students.137 Some states that require charter schools to provide transportation to students only require that they follow the same standards of other schools in the district, such as providing transportation only to those residing in the school district in which the charter school physically exists even though charter schools generally can enroll students from surrounding school districts. Failure to provide transportation may reinforce the segregative effect of charter schools by eliminating the option of low-income minority students to enroll in these schools due to a lack of transportation.138 Another education reform law, the No Child Left Behind Act,139 allows students to transfer from “failing” schools, which are often schools with predominantly minority populations. It does not require that transportation be provided to students who wish to transfer. Although this provision has the potential to reduce segregated schools, not providing transportation to nonfailing schools means that many minority students will not be able to take advantage of this option. Lack of access to transportation also affects access to higher education. Many people of color, for financial and other reasons, attend local community colleges or do not live on campus, often requiring that they find transportation other than walking. For example, minority students make up 30 percent of community college enrollment nationally and their enrollment is often higher in urban areas.140 It is likely that at least some of these students rely on public transportation. These students are likely to experience long or inconvenient commutes as many colleges were designed to serve a region and not necessarily to be accessible by public transportation. It is not known how many students who cannot afford a car decide not to go to college or drop out in the face of an overly arduous commute on inadequate public transportation. Federal and local transportation policies must find ways to better serve the transportation needs of those most dependent on public transportation or the dream of equal access to educational opportunities will remain deferred for many students of color.

1. The lack of transportation also causes health risks for people in the urban area
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(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Transportation policies that favor reliance on automobiles and building busy roads in minority communities also raise another public health concern: personal safety—particularly that of minorities and low-income individuals who live in urban areas. Overall, African Americans and Latinos have a pedestrian fatality rate that is almost twice as high as that of whites,164 and they have a higher percentage of pedestrian fatalities than their percentage of the population in the United States.165 One study found that the most dangerous metropolitan areas for walking were Orlando, Tampa, West Palm Beach, Miami, and Jacksonville, Florida; Memphis and Nashville, Tennessee; Houston and Dallas–Fort Worth, Texas; and Phoenix.166 Each of these areas has a significant minority population. A study of Atlanta pedestrian fatality rates during 1994–1998 found that whites had a significantly lower pedestrian fatality rate of 1.64 per 100,000 than Latinos (3.85) and African Americans (9.74).167 Newspaper accounts have reported that in Orange County, California and in the Virginia suburbs of Washington, DC, Latinos suffer a greater percentage of pedestrian fatalities than their population in those areas.168 Disparities in the number of pedestrian deaths are exacerbated because higher percentages of people of color than of whites do not own a car and must rely on walking as a primary mode of transportation. An analysis of 2000 census data show that these minorities are much more likely than whites to walk to work. While 2.6 percent of non-Hispanic white workers walked to work in 2000, 3.2 percent of African-American workers, and nearly 4 percent of Latino and Asian American workers, walked to work. One study of pedestrian injuries found that children who are pedestrians are at increased risk for serious traumatic brain injury and lifelong disability if they live in poverty, face a large traffic volume and traffic moving at high speeds, and lack space to play other than sidewalks and streets.170 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration data show that the most dangerous roads for pedestrians are those that have multiple lanes, high speeds, no sidewalks, long distances between intersections or crosswalks, and roadways lined with large commercial establishments and apartment blocks.171 Relying on walking for transportation may have other negative effects. One study found that low-income mothers relying on walking as a primary mode of transportation suffered physical fatigue and stress from having to manage walking long distances with young children in all types of weather and on busy roads.172 Walking and bicycling have been widely promoted as efficient, low-cost ways to increase physical activity and thus improve overall health.173 However, minorities and those who live in areas of poverty do not live in areas conducive to walking and bicycling. The Centers for Disease Control identified the most common barriers preventing children from walking and bicycling to school as dangerous motor-vehicle traffic and long distances.174 States are spending very little federal transportation funding to improve conditions for walking.175 As documented by the Surface Transportation Policy Project, a national organization concerned with improving the nation’s transportation system, “less than one percent (0.7 percent) of federal transportation construction, operations, and maintenance funds are spent to ensure a safe walking environment.”176 Transportation policy should support both public transit and safe environments for pedestrians.

1. The lack of transportation also constrains them from attaining good jobs. They are forced to work at unsanitary places.
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(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Federal law has acknowledged the value of allowing hiring preferences for individuals in certain low-income communities—local hiring preferences for workers on tribal reservations and in the Appalachian region178 of the country are or have been allowed—**but these preferences overlook most of America’s low-income communities, particularly in urban areas.** TEA-21 allows states to use a percentage of federal transportation funding to pay for supportive services to help women and minorities enter the transportation construction trades, but few states exercise this option.179 In Los Angeles, a coalition of community groups, churches, and local elected leaders persuaded the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority to incorporate a local hiring preference into the contract for a multibillion-dollar multimodal project. The project involved excavation of a 21-mile trench under numerous major and minor roads to lay a rail bed that now links the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to distribution centers in downtown Los Angeles. The project runs through a number of very poor and minority communities in south central and east Los Angeles. The contract required that 30 percent of all hours worked on the mid-corridor portion of the project go to local residents. It also funded a pre-apprenticeship program, which provided stipends for 650 local residents. More than 700 pre-apprenticeship program graduates were placed in jobs in the construction industry; 188 received jobs on the project. Thirty-one percent of all hours worked on the mid-corridor section of the project were performed by local residents, and 75 percent of them were minorities. Of that group, 190 were former welfare recipients and 102 were women with children.180 The project finished on-time and under budget. The Alameda Corridor program succeeded only because a portion of the project was funded by a loan from DOT rather than a federally aided highway grant. The only portion of the project on which the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority could require a local hiring preference was on the mid-corridor portion; other portions of the project were excluded. Initially, the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority would not agree to a local hiring preference unless DOT clarified that such a preference was legal. Grassroots groups successfully sought an opinion from DOT, which authorized the local hiring preference on the mid-corridor portion of the project, but concluded that Congress would need to create a new exemption to allow future local hiring preferences on federally aided highway projects. The significance of hiring local residents to work in the transportation construction industry extends beyond a particular construction project. As the overrepresentation of Latinos in the construction industry suggests, these job opportunities provide the real possibility of sustained employment in a well-paying industry with the prospect for career growth. Given projected growth in the industry and the transferability of construction skills, strategies that ensure greater participation by minorities in local construction projects ultimately may create significant employment opportunities for minorities, particularly for low-income families with few other options.

And this type of everyday violence must be prioritized in your calculations. It is the largest proximate cause of war- creates priming that psychologically structures the worst atrocities

Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois ‘4

(Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn)

(Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34). Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite. As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematic- ally and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families. Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization

Thus the plan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase funding for mass transit.

Only providing mass transit to the general public is the ONLY way to resolve the issues of environmental racism and discrimination

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

TEA-21, which directs more than $200 billion in transportation funding to states and communities and determines how these funds may be used, will expire on September 30, 2003. The reauthorization of the act provides Congress with an enormous opportunity to incorporate provisions that will meaningfully address travel issues and concerns of minority and low-income communities across the nation. The following are some recommendations that follow from the issues raised in the report and from what we know from existing research. Implementation of these recommendations would help address the racial injustices created by transportation policies across the country and advance the national—and constitutional—goal of equality. 1. Increase funding for public transportation, and develop new programs and support existing programs that improve minorities’ mobility. Public transportation is a public service that should be supported. Also, support programs focusing on the needs of low- income and minority transit users to provide reliable connections to job sites and other necessary destinations. For example, the Job Access and Reverse Commute programs support a number of promising efforts to connect low-wage workers to jobs and services, but additional funding is needed to examine which of these efforts are most effective and most likely to be successfully replicated. Also, a handful of significant research identifies increased access to cars as having a positive impact on the ability of minorities to gain access to and retain employment, which suggests that pilot programs that help low-income minorities access cars when public transit is inadequate should be developed.

Only way to disrupt environmental racism is through mass transit. Mass transit provides a unique opportunity to build coalition between citizens and the federal government, that is key to challenging environmental racism.

Weir 01

(Margaret Weir, Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago in 1986.  Her research and teaching fields include American political development, urban politics and policy, political sociology, and comparative studies of the welfare state, “METROPOLITAN COALITION-BUILDING STRATEGIES” DM)

Proclaiming that “we are all in it together,” urban advocates have for the past decade sought to promote city-suburban political coalitions.1 Their call for concerted regional action to address urban social and economic problems reflects a new political reality: the sharp scaling back of federal urban aid since the 1980s, even as concentrated urban poverty continued to grow. As federal dollars grew more scarce and social policy devolution granted states more discretion over spending, the need to gain new allies and to build power in new arenas became increasingly evident to many urban advocates. The call for metropolitan alliances also reflects a long underappreciated economic reality: the economic fate of cities and suburbs are linked. A wealth of studies now documents the interdependence of cities and suburbs.2 Many of these studies argue that all nonpoor suburbs have a long-term interest in reducing urban poverty because such poverty depresses regional economic growth. Others point to the shared economic interests of cities and particular suburbs, especially fiscally distressed suburbs. Despite this outpouring of research, identifying the “we” and figuring out how to get them together has proven challenging. Efforts to build equity-oriented metropolitan alliances have faced a formidable array of obstacles. These include longstanding political animosities between cities and suburbs, bitter racial divisions, entrenched administrative practices, and the narrow and short-term perspective that dominates the thinking of politicians and civic organizations in cities as well as suburbs. Yet, in metropolitan regions across the country, urban advocates have been building new alliances of varying reach and durability. This paper evaluates what we can learn from these efforts, drawing particularly on case material related to improving infrastructure and investment in low-income communities.3 I highlight four factors that appear consistently in successful and durable collaborations for reducing metropolitan inequalities. The first is the central role of relationship building among coalition members. The second is the ability to reframe problems so that formerly disparate interests find some common ground for collaborative action. The third is access to information and the capacity to analyze often complex data. The fourth is the ability to operate effectively in the multiple political arenas that span the federal system. After illustrating these factors, I then show how each of them has mattered for the development of specific metropolitan alliances. Finally, **effective influence at the state and federal levels is particularly important for most successful coalitions**, the last part of the paper shows how some Case material for this paper is draw from the secondary literature as well as from my own research, including interviews in Chicago and Washington D.C. with state legislators, city officials, advocates in the areas of transportation and community reinvestment, and other individuals notable metropolitan alliances have won access to those arenas. FOUR ELEMENTS OF DURABLE METROPOLITAN COLLABORATION Relationship-Building. Relationship-building is key to durable and successful collaborations. It is not only the first step, it is the central ongoing task of coalition-building. In efforts to build coalitions that cross metropolitan political boundaries or that stretch across a state, advocates in the same broad field may not know one another. When coalitions seek to unite groups active in different issue areas, the problem is compounded. Most research on relationship-building emphasizes the importance of repeated interactions in building trust.4 Small steps that link different groups in common actions are an essential part of the process. In addition to these close ties among direct cooperators, members of successful collaborations have knowledge of and access to more distant interests. Such “weak ties” can provide resources, knowledge or political support at critical moments. This suggests that it is well worth seeking out relationships with groups that have power or a reputation for power even if their immediate value to the coalition may not be evident. Organizations and coalitions use hiring decisions and member recruitment to extend the range of relationships. Defining Common Interests. Thinking about problems in regional terms does not come naturally to most metropolitan actors. Thinking is ways that link the interests of the urban poor to others in the metropolitan area is even more rare. Political boundaries promote narrow and local perspectives on regional problems. Many suburban residents look to their city boundaries as a form of protection from urban problems; for many localities, strengthening these boundaries has long been a central goal. Local politicians, driven by short-term electoral considerations and hot-button racial issues, often reinforce such narrow perspectives. Despite the continuing power of these barriers to collaboration, there are several processes through which groups within metropolitan areas can build common perspectives. The search for such areas of agreement does not imply complete overlap of agendas across groups or even similar motivations. Groups can begin to cooperate even around small areas of agreement. One approach to defining common interests involves what sociologists call the “strategic framing” of issues. Frames can be defined as “the specific metaphors, symbolic representations and cognitive cues” that define the issue.5 What is the issue about and whose interests does it touch? Investigators who study social movements point to the importance of framing in determining the scope and ultimately the success of social movements. Strategic framing can seek to redefine an issue so that groups who did not see their interests as intertwined find new bases of cooperation. The movement for “smart growth with equity” attem

pts such a redefinition of interests.6 The aim is to unite advocates for low-income communities with environmentalists and other potential allies, including business and labor. The interests of environmentalists and advocates for low-income communities have historically been difficult to reconcile.7 The anti-growth perspective of many environmental groups clashed with the support for jobs and growth on the part of urban advocates. More recently, advocates for low-income people and environmentalists have tangled directly over growth controls and affordable housing. The smart growth movement attempts to locate common ground among these groups. Environmentalists’ concerns about sprawl need to be addressed through revitalizing declining urban neighborhoods and providing affordable housing as part of revitalization. Portland, Oregon, which implemented state land use controls nearly 30 years ago, is widely acknowledged as the leader developing this kind of coalition. A similar logic is at work in recent efforts in Illinois to link environmental groups primarily concerned with stopping highway development with urban groups that support improved public transportation. A second way in which common interests can be built is when antagonistic groups learn through experience that their interests are at least partly complementary. The role of the Community 6 Reinvestment Act (CRA) in making banks realize there was a profit to be made in lending to low and moderate income home buyers provides an example of this process. First enacted in 1977, the CRA is an anti-redlining measure that required banks to lend throughout the areas from which they draw deposits. Although many banks vigorously resisted the measure and regulators failed to enforce it, in cities where local community-based organizations were strong, the CRA sparked collaborations that proved profitable to banks.8 By the 1990s, most banks had established community affairs departments and had discovered that it was indeed in their interest to lend to low and moderate income communities. Some initial coercion or regulation may be necessary to promote this kind of learning. For example, Oregon’s homebuilding industry initially opposed the state’s land use regulations but once they were in place, some of the builders came to support the law. A third way that low income advocates can win regional allies is by persuading regional organizations to extend their mission to encompass issues of highest concern to low-income communities. In many cases, this does not entail redefining interests, but rather broadening the action agenda. The American Lung Association’s increased attention to the asthma of inner city children provides an example of this kind of mission extension. The advantage of this strategy is that it does not require creating new organizations but rather extending the capacities of existing organizations. The emergence of new problems can provide an opportunity for redefining problems and identifying new allies. The past five years of economic growth have prompted business leaders in many regions to see sprawl, transportation, and the spatial mismatch between jobs and housing as problems that concern them. In some regions, such as Chicago, this has generated new business initiatives centrally concerned with promoting regional equity.9 In other settings, advocates have to press to ensure that equity considerations enter into business thinking about regionalism. Information and Expertise. Information and expertise are essential components of regional coalition- building strategies. They are particularly important in launching new policy initiatives because data can help cast issues in a new light, either documenting the extent of a problem or highlighting common interests that may not be apparent on the surface. Data and expertise can show that some solutions are more feasible than previously thought. Data can also highlight patterns of public spending that fail to Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) of 1975, which required banks to disclose the geographic location of their residential lending. The availability of that information, combined with new data disclosure requirements after 1989, was essential to showing patterns of noncompliance with the CRA. Disclosure requirements are not always sufficient to make data useful. Lending data was initially released in a form that made it difficult to use; only concerted pressure produced a more useable format. Although the Transportation Equity Act of 1998 (TEA-21) required the federal government to release data about public spending on transportation, local advocates have thus far found the data difficult to use to document unequal geographic patterns of spending. Even when data is available in a useful format, community organizations may not have the capacity to analyze it. Because of these difficulties, intermediary organizations that specialize in analyzing data are often critical components of regional coalitions. These organizations can build the expertise and invest in the computer equipment and software needed to analyze often complex data. In the field of community reinvestment, organizations such as the Woodstock Institute, the National Training and Information Center, and the National Community Reinvestment Coalition have played an essential role by providing analyses of local bank lending patterns for community groups. Such analyses are necessary for any plausible challenge to lending practices. More recently, these intermediary groups have also played a key role in state campaigns to regulate the latest predatory lending practices. In addition to analyzing data, intermediary organizations can produce new information. Using a variety of strategies, including surveys, new information is often a critical first step to documenting a address or even exacerbate some problems. The increase in home mortgage lending would not have been possible without the Home 9 common problem. New technologies have made information more valuable in organizing new coalitions. The development of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping is a particularly valuable tool. In his book Metropolitics Myron Orfield stresses the key role that large colored maps played in visually displaying the common interests among the elements of the metropolitan coalition he sought to build in the Twin Cities.10 Visual evidence of the common tax burden that the cities and some suburbs bore for the development of “executive suburbs” was powerful way to show doubtful suburbs that they had common fiscal interests with the city. In some cities, local intermediary organizations, such as Chicago’s Metropolitan Chicago Information Center now can provide local organizations access to these tools. Creating intermediaries that local organizations can access is itself a process requiring organization. The most successful uses of information occur when a supra local network of organizations is built to address similar problems. Such networks facilitate sharing information as well as strategy. Multi-level Political Action. Then notion of“ metropolitan collaboration” implies that action is confined to one level of government. The word “collaboration” implies a conflict-free process. Yet, successful regional collaborations have the ability to influence policy at the federal and state levels; they also possess sufficient political power to deploy more conflict-oriented approaches when necessary. Even in an era of significant policy devolution, federal regulations significantly affect the prospects for metropolitan collaborations. In many policy areas, federal regulations set the framework for metropolitan action. They can tilt the balance of power among local actors in ways that give weaker groups a foot in the door. For example, regulations regarding disclosure of information (as in the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act) and regulations requiring bank compliance (as in the Community Reinvestment Act) dramatically changed the balance of power between banks and community organizations. Federal actions can create new arenas of decision making that shake up existing power relationships, as in the 1992 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA gave more authority and discretion over spending decisions to Metropolitan Planning Organizations in hopes of curbing the power of state highway departments. Federal provisions can provide new channels of funding as in TEA-21's Access to Jobs program, which gave community groups a direct stake in regional initiatives to insert equity concerns in transportation decisions. Access to state politics is particularly important for creating and sustaining regional alliances. Because there are very few regional organizations with significant decision making power, most key regional decisions actually get made at the state level. The entrenched localism of much decision making in the states and the salience of partisan divisions has made this a particularly tough arena for promoting city-suburb coalitions. State-wide campaigns supported by a wide array of local groups – often united by only thin agreement, rather than deep common interest – may be the best strategy for prevailing in state politics.

Impact- Education Segregation

The unequal access to transportation uniquely hurts the education system, furthering segregation and lack of opportunity that contributes to the urban sprawl

Bullard at al 02

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**Growing Smarter: Building Equity into a Fair Growth Agenda” DM)**

The drift toward separate and unequal society has not abated. America’s metropolitan world is more complex than the black-white race relations paradigm. New ethnic immigrant enclaves now dot the urban and suburban landscape. A new wave of ethnic segregation dominates many large central city neighborhoods, first ring suburbs, deep suburbs, and some rural communities in metropolitan regions that attract low-wage laborers. The drift toward racially segmented metropolitan areas is most pronounced in public education. Schools are a powerful perpetrator of metropolitan polarization.24 Rapid growth of mega-schools on undeveloped land is replacing the traditional small, walkable community-centered schools. Schools built in recent years take up more land and are farther from the city. These large schools outside of the city promotes sprawl and destroy the sense of community of those neighborhoods that have to bus their students to these schools. Urban and suburban schools are not created equal. Huge disparities exist between the education quality and funding of suburbs and inner-city schools. These disparities are buttressed by the archaic school property tax financing method. Over $326 billion was collected for public elementary-secondary education for the year 1997-98 in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. An average of $6,189 was spent on each student—an increase of 4.5 percent from $5,923 in school year 1996-79.25 Students of color comprise 36 percent of students enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools. Over a third of the nation’s children attend schools where the enrollment is 90 percent to 100 percent minority. Students of color 4 comprise a majority of the students enrolled in nearly all of the Sierra Club’s “most sprawled- threatened” large cities. *These cities include Atlanta (93.4%), St. Louis (82.2%), Washington, DC (96.0%), Cincinnati (71.0%), Kansas City (81.9%), Denver (74.7%), Seattle (59.0%), Minneapolis (67.9%), St. Paul (60.6%), Ft. Lauderdale (54.0%), Chicago (89.7%), Detroit (95.1%), Baltimore (87.2%), Cleveland (79.7%), Tampa (44.7%) and Dallas (89.9%).* People of color enrollment ranged from a low of 44.7 percent in Tampa-Hillsborough schools to 96.0 percent in Washington, DC schools. Huge disparities often separate the highest-spending and lowest-spending school districts in a given sate. In California, the gap ranges from $16,343 per pupil at Indian Springs Elementary to $2,713 at Pacific Union Elementary. In New Jersey, Union County Regional spends $18,116 per pupil while Prospect Park Borough spends $5,144.26 The GAO reports that wealthy school districts had about 24 percent more total funding per weighted pupil than poor districts in the 1991-92 school year.27 Over a third of the nation’s children attend schools where the enrollment is 90 percent to 100 percent minority.28

Impact- Apartheid

Sprawls creates a racial apartheid that exacerbates the current problems of economic opportunity and poverty

Bullard at al 02

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**Growing Smarter: Building Equity into a Fair Growth Agenda” DM)**

A form of urban apartheid exists in many metropolitan regions with clear economic and racial lines drawn between the “haves” and “have nots.” The notion of a racially integrated America is just an idea whose time has not come. While some progress has been eked out over the past four decades, no dramatic breakthrough has been made. Sociologists John Logan summed the current state of housing affairs in the United States. He states: “It’s a mistake to talk about a breakthrough. The only evidence of [integration] comes from places where there are few minorities to incorporate. In the other America, where 80 to 90 percent of minorities live, there’s been very small change [in integration], if any.”34 Racial segregation in housing, as well as schools and jobs, is fundamental to the geography of the modern American city.35 The top three most segregated cities for African Americans in 2000 were Detroit, Memphis, and Chicago.36 In addition to being the most segregated big city for blacks, Detroit also leads the nation in office sprawl (percent of office space located outside the central city) and falls at the bottom of the list of metropolitan areas whose workers use public transit. Where the economic activity centers and public transport systems extend are not unrelated. Similarly, spatial mobility and social mobility are interrelated. Sprawl development promotes racial and economic segregation. Sociologists Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton contend that “segregation constitutes a powerful impediment to black socioeconomic progress.”37 Residential apartheid continues to be the dominant housing pattern among African Americans.38 Most growth in metropolitan regions is occurring outside of central cities. Over 80 percent of the country’s future growth (if current trends hold) is expected to occur in “edge cities” and other suburbs.39 Nationally, 32 percent of Americans live in central urban areas, 32 percent live in urban fringe areas, 25 percent live in rural areas, 6 percent live in small towns, and 5 percent live in midsize towns. New job growth and economic activity centers are concentrated on the fringe of the metropolitan areas and beyond. The exodus of low-skilled jobs to the suburbs disproportionately affects central-city residents, particularly people of color, who often face more limited choice of housing location and transportation in growing areas. Between 1990 and 1997, jobs on the fringe of metropolitan areas grew by 19 percent versus 4 percent job growth in core areas. While metropolitan regions expanded, many of America’s central cities became forgotten places.40 The Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University in it’s *The State of the Nation’s Housing: 2000* reports that between 1990 and 1998, new construction added 25 percent or more to the housing stock of 21 metropolitan areas in the West and South.41 From 1990 and 1997, new construction in outlying counties in metropolitan areas grew by 15%, compared with only 5% housing growth in counties closer to central cities. In 1998, 12.7 percent of the United States population lived below the poverty line.42 Despite record employment figures over the past decade, the poverty rate for African Americans changed from 30.8 percent in 1989 to 26.1 percent in 1998, still nearly three times the rate of poverty for white Americans (10.5 percent). The poverty rate among Hispanics was 27.1 percent in 1997.43 Sprawl development concentrates poverty in central core areas.

Impact- Education

Lack of access to transportation has a negative affect on the education of children that leads to segregated schools, and lack of pursuit for higher education

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Although the large majority of K–12 students do not need to rely on public transit to get to school, for those who do, access to that transportation may mean the difference between attending and missing school. For instance, during efforts to obtain free student transit passes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission serving the San Francisco Bay area, evidence was presented that students without access to public transportation would not attend school.133 A number of high school students in Oakland and El Cerrito, which have significant minority populations, testified that they needed free transit passes because their families sometimes had to decide between food and bus fare.134 In Portland, Oregon, the school district does not provide bus service for students living within 1.5 miles of a school. Sisters in Action for Power, an organization focusing on the interests of low-income girls and girls of color, pressed for free rides to high school on public buses after its survey of more than 2,000 students found that 11 percent reported missing school due to their inability to meet transportation costs.135 Students in Providence, Rhode Island, in an informal survey of more than 500 high school students, found that a number of students whose families were unable to afford bus passes stayed home and missed school, especially during harsh winter days, and others got detention for being late because of the amount of time it took them to walk to school.136 Currently, students attending Providence public high schools who live within three miles of their school must walk or provide their own means of transportation. Limited funding for schools makes it difficult for school districts to transport all children in school buses. Recent severe cuts in school budgets makes it likely that more school districts will need to reduce the transportation services they provide and that more children will need to rely on public transportation to attend school. Transportation policies should recognize and address this growing need. In addition, education reform laws do not always consider the impact of access to transportation. For example, states authorizing charter schools do not always require that the schools provide transportation to students.137 Some states that require charter schools to provide transportation to students only require that they follow the same standards of other schools in the district, such as providing transportation only to those residing in the school district in which the charter school physically exists even though charter schools generally can enroll students from surrounding school districts. Failure to provide transportation may reinforce the segregative effect of charter schools by eliminating the option of low-income minority students to enroll in these schools due to a lack of transportation.138 Another education reform law, the No Child Left Behind Act,139 allows students to transfer from “failing” schools, which are often schools with predominantly minority populations. It does not require that transportation be provided to students who wish to transfer. Although this provision has the potential to reduce segregated schools, not providing transportation to nonfailing schools means that many minority students will not be able to take advantage of this option. Lack of access to transportation also affects access to higher education. Many people of color, for financial and other reasons, attend local community colleges or do not live on campus, often requiring that they find transportation other than walking. For example, minority students make up 30 percent of community college enrollment nationally and their enrollment is often higher in urban areas.140 It is likely that at least some of these students rely on public transportation. These students are likely to experience long or inconvenient commutes as many colleges were designed to serve a region and not necessarily to be accessible by public transportation. It is not known how many students who cannot afford a car decide not to go to college or drop out in the face of an overly arduous commute on inadequate public transportation. Federal and local transportation policies must find ways to better serve the transportation needs of those most dependent on public transportation or the dream of equal access to educational opportunities will remain deferred for many students of color.

Impact- Asthma

Environmental Racism cause health issues, specifically the use of freeways and transportation causes people in poor communities to more likely be affected by asthma
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(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Like Detroit, many urban areas have significant pollution, much of which can be traced to transportation policies that favor highway development and automobile travel over public transportation. In addition, these transportation policies combined with land use or zoning policies lead to more toxic usage of land in poor and minority neighborhoods than in affluent areas and areas with fewer minorities.147 Higher percentages of African Americans (65%) and Latinos (80%) compared with whites (57%) live in areas with substandard air quality.148 Research suggests that these polluted environments in turn result in higher rates of respiratory diseases, such as asthma.149 It is known that the occurrence of asthma and asthma-related deaths is higher in African Americans and Latinos than in whites.150 Asthma is almost twice as common among African Americans as it is among whites. Even more disturbing are the disparities in asthma deaths among African Americans and whites: Though African Americans make up approximately 12 percent of the U.S. population, they account for about 24 percent of all asthma deaths.151 A report by the Environmental Protection Agency found that non-Hispanic African-American children who live in families with incomes below the poverty level have the highest rate (8.3%) of asthma of all racial groups.152 While it is not known to what extent these disparities are due to outdoor pollution, research studies have found a strong and significant correlation between residing near heavy automobile or truck traffic and increased difficulties with respiratory function and higher incidence of disease, such as asthma, in children.153 Specifically, studies have found that high concentrations of air pollutants from vehicles are linked to asthma.154 A study of Atlanta during the 1996 Summer Olympics when alternative transportation strategies were implemented155 found that hospitals and doctors saw significantly fewer children for serious asthma problems.156 A study examining the effect of daily air pollution levels on asthmatic children living in the Bronx and East Harlem, New York; Baltimore; Washington, DC; Detroit; Cleveland; Chicago; and St. Louis found that increased exposure to certain air pollution was associated with asthma.157 The neighborhoods of Harlem and South Bronx in New York City have received attention due to the high rates of asthma among their residents. Central Harlem’s population is approximately 88 percent African Americans and 10 percent white.158 South Bronx has a population of approximately 79 percent Latino and 19 percent African American.159 Neither of these communities has been meeting air quality standards.160 Most of the area’s bus depots were sited in Harlem161 and like the South Bronx, it contains or is surrounded by heavily traveled commuter highways.162 One study of these communities found the rates of developmental and respiratory diseases (such as asthma) are disproportionately high

Impact- Injustice

Uniquely, transportation policies in the status quo have directly affected the condition of living for people in poverty, only increasing their subjugation
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Transportation policies have a direct effect on low-income, minority communities by making it difficult to access transportation to various places. Federal, state, and local transportation policies emphasizing highway construction have led to dependency on automobiles and rising transportation costs. Generally, 80 cents of every dollar spent on federal surface transportation programs is earmarked for highways, and 20 cents is earmarked for public transportation (which includes both bus and rail transit). Although 20 percent of federal transportation funding is generally allocated to public transit, for various reasons, states are unlikely to be devoting 20 percent of their overall transportation expenditures to public transportation.65 Thirty states restrict use of their gasoline tax revenues to funding highway programs only.66 Revenues from gas taxes are the single largest funding source for transportation programs. Several other states allow only a small portion of gas tax revenues to be spent on transit. For example, Michigan allocates for public transportation 10 percent or less of its state gas tax and related transportation revenue.67 In Alabama, the Birmingham metropolitan region has struggled to raise state and local revenue to match more than $80 million in federal grants for public transportation largely because the state constitution prohibits the use of gas tax revenue for this purpose.68 At the local level, funds spent on bus transit capital and operating expenses sometimes add up to a small percentage of funds spent on all different types of transit and may be much less than the 20 percent allocated by federal policy. that restrict allocation of public funds to public transit contribute to increasing household transportation expenses, particularly for low-income families. Data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey suggest that low-income households devote a greater proportion of their income to transportation-related expenses regardless of whether they use public transportation or own a car. A Surface Transportation Policy Project report found that in 1998, those in the lowest income quintile spent 36 percent of their household budget on transportation, compared with those in the highest income quintile, who spent only 14 percent on transportation (see Figure 3). Low-income workers who use a vehicle to commute spend 7 percent more of their income on transportation costs compared with those using public transportation In some metropolitan areas, households spend as much for transportation as they do for housing.71 Another measure of the impact of transportation costs on low-income and minority households is the rate of increase in transportation expenditures. Between 1992 and 2000, households with incomes of less than $20,000 saw the amount of their income spent on transportation increase by 36.5 percent or more (households with incomes between $5,000 and $9,999 spent 57 percent more on transportation than they did in 1992). In comparison, households with incomes of $70,000 and above only spent 16.8 percent more on transportation expenses than they did in 1992. This research suggests not only that low-income families are spending more of their incomes on transportation, but also that transportation costs are increasing at a faster rate for these households. These trends indicate that household transportation costs are increasing over time, meaning that households have less to spend on housing, food, health care, insurance, education, and other needs. Other evidence suggests that the debt incurred by families related to car ownership makes buying a home more difficult. Cars represent a major household expenditure but quickly depreciate as an asset compared with real property.72 A major factor contributing to these rising costs is the increase in sprawling development patterns manifest in U.S. metropolitan areas. Sprawling development translates into longer travel distances and more auto dependency. Low-density, noncontiguous development also makes public transit an infeasible option for many commuters. As public transit service diminishes, a household’s auto dependency increases. In addition, much research links inefficient land use patterns to negative impacts on air quality, public health, and energy consumption

Impact- Education

Lack of transportation has a direct impact on education
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Creating barriers to access to education is another indirect effect of transportation policies. Following the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education,125 “busing” and yellow school buses became well-known symbols of the fight for equal educational opportunities for African Americans. The significance of these symbols is diminishing because more and more school systems are returning to the idea of neighborhood schools and courts are declaring school districts “unitary,” meaning they have eliminated the effects of past segregation as far as they are able. Today’s transportation policies, however, still have an effect on access to educational opportunities for a number of minorities and individuals from low-income communities. No longer do most students rely on yellow school buses to get to school. Many students depend on public transportation to attend school and college as well as participate in extracurricular activities. A recent study of this issue estimated that nationally, during normal school hours, the majority—60 percent—of all student trips were made by car and that these were primarily trips to and from school.126 One study found that students traveling to or from school in cities of more than 500,000 accounted for 15 percent of all public transportation trips.127 It was estimated in 1996 that 20 percent of school children in California were using public transportation or other special transportation service to go to school and that growing numbers of students were relying on public transportation in other states such as Ohio.128 As The National Academies’ Transportation Research Board stated, “transit services in large urban areas have long been used to transport students, particularly those in high school and junior high school.”129 While there is no research documenting how many of these students taking public transportation are minorities, it stands to reason that many of the K–12 (kindergarten through 12th grade) students who depend on public transportation are minorities located in urban areas with a developed public transportation system. Supporting this idea is the fact that Los Angeles,130 Houston,131 and Washington, DC132—cities with significant minority populations—provide discounted public bus fares for students. Although the large majority of K–12 students do not need to rely on public transit to get to school, for those who do, access to that transportation may mean the difference between attending and missing school. For instance, during efforts to obtain free student transit passes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission serving the San Francisco Bay area, evidence was presented that students without access to public transportation would not attend school.133 A number of high school students in Oakland and El Cerrito, which have significant minority populations, testified that they needed free transit passes because their families sometimes had to decide between food and bus fare.134 In Portland, Oregon, the school district does not provide bus service for students living within 1.5 miles of a school. Sisters in Action for Power, an organization focusing on the interests of low-income girls and girls of color, pressed for free rides to high school on public buses after its survey of more than 2,000 students found that 11 percent reported missing school due to their inability to meet transportation costs.135 Students in Providence, Rhode Island, in an informal survey of more than 500 high school students, found that a number of students whose families were unable to afford bus passes stayed home and missed school, especially during harsh winter days, and others got detention for being late because of the amount of time it took them to walk to school.136 Currently, students attending Providence public high schools who live within three miles of their school must walk or provide their own means of transportation. Limited funding for schools makes it difficult for school districts to transport all children in school buses. Recent severe cuts in school budgets makes it likely that more school districts will need to reduce the transportation services they provide and that more children will need to rely on public transportation to attend school. Transportation policies should recognize and address this growing need. In addition, education reform laws do not always consider the impact of access to transportation. For example, states authorizing charter schools do not always require that the schools provide transportation to students.137 Some states that require charter schools to provide transportation to students only require that they follow the same standards of other schools in the district, such as providing transportation only to those residing in the school district in which the charter school physically exists even though charter schools generally can enroll students from surrounding school districts. Failure to provide transportation may reinforce the segregative effect of charter schools by eliminating the option of low-income minority students to enroll in these schools due to a lack of transportation.138 Another education reform law, the No Child Left Behind Act,139 allows students to transfer from “failing” schools, which are often schools with predominantly minority populations. It does not require that transportation be provided to students who wish to transfer. Although this provision has the potential to reduce segregated schools, not providing transportation to non failing schools means that many minority students will not be able to take advantage of this option. Lack of access to transportation also affects access to higher education. Many people of color, for financial and other reasons, attend local community colleges or do not live on campus, often requiring that they find transportation other than walking. For example, minority students make up 30 percent of community college enrollment nationally and their enrollment is often higher in urban areas.140 It is likely that at least some of these students rely on public transportation. These students are likely to experience long or inconvenient commutes as many colleges were designed to serve a region and not necessarily to be accessible by public transportation. It is not known how many students who cannot afford a car decide not to go to college or drop out in the face of an overly arduous commute on inadequate public transportation. Federal and local transportation policies must find ways to better serve the transportation needs of those most dependent on public transportation or the dream of equal access to educational opportunities will remain deferred for many students of color.

Impact-Health

Lack of transportation forces people to walk long distance, this has lead to negative impacts on peoples lives

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

In addition to language barriers, other barriers prevent minority and low-income communities from participating in transportation planning processes. The two main bodies responsible for transportation planning are state departments of transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations. These agencies bear the difficult and vital responsibility of planning transportation for a region in a way that achieves the greatest system efficiency, mobility, and access while addressing environmental and social concerns. The mandates for environmental justice and social equity in state departments of transportation207 and MPOs’ activities are Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and President Clinton’s 1994 Executive Order 12898. President Clinton’s order states that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” Effects on human health and the environment have implicit connections to social and economic well-being as well as questions of equity. DOT recognized these connections and promotes three core principles of environmental justice that states and MPOs should use in their land use and transportation analyses: 1) To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations; 2) To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and 3) To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

Coalition Building Good

Coalition building solves, integrating governmental policy along with the voices of the people is only hope to solve for the current injustice to those living in poverty

Bullard at al 02

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**Growing Smarter: Building Equity into a Fair Growth Agenda” DM)**

People of color communities are not waiting for government, business, or mainstream environmental groups to come up with a “silver-bullet” solution to address race, equity, and urban sprawl problems that directly and indirectly impact them. Some communities are taking action. Whether central city, suburb, or rural, it will take a coordinated effort among the divergent interests to fix the nation’s transportation problems. It will also take time and resources to arrest sprawl and negative impacts it has on central cities. Clearly, people of color organizations that have long and rich track record on social justice and equity have a ready-made issue in transportation and smart growth. They need only siege the issue. They might bring their considerable collective resources to the table. *Proactive Anti-Racism Strategy.* Race still matters in the United States. Addressing social equity and improving race relations need to be an explicit priority in smart growth initiatives. Racial polarization is impeding community and economic development in almost every metropolitan region that have large concentrations of people of color. Dismantling racial barriers and institutional racism would go a long way in boosting financial incentives and reinvestment in central city neighborhoods. *Building a Equity/Fair Growth Movement.* The equity and smart growth issue has the potential for bringing together diverse community-based organizations, homeowners associations, civic clubs, academic institutions, activists, and government to form broad coalitions and alliances. Working together, neighborhood groups in central cities, suburbs, and surrounding rural areas can band together to arrest sprawl and at the same time begin to address longstanding equity issues that divide people by race, income, class, and spatial location. *Plans to Narrow the Public Education Gap.* Education is an investment in the future. The nation’s public schools remain an integral part of our nation’s future. Disparities exist in financing urban and suburban schools. Innovative approaches need to be taken to equalize inherent funding inequities resulting from an outdated taxing system—namely 7 property taxes. As an example, tax revenue collected from retail sales can be shared regionally, allowing jurisdictions with struggling educational systems to invest in them. This would enable the region to provide a well-trained workforce to attract new economic investments. *Neighborhood Revitalization without Gentrification.* Neighborhood revitalization initiatives that minimize “gentrification” pressures and displacement of incumbent residents should be undertaken. In-fill development should be encouraged in place of uncontrolled sprawl. Public space should be planned in the general welfare of all residents, regardless of race, income, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Other strategies include: provide economic opportunities, including jobs and housing linkage programs; develop and enforce Fair Share Housing; institute Community Land Trusts and land banking that could be used for developments from parks to housing; and design Community Equity Impact Reports to assess the benefits of projects to the community. *Regional Fair Housing Initiatives.* Discrimination is still a major barrier to open housing in most regions. Discrimination costs. A targeted regional fair housing strategy could maximize housing, employment, and educational opportunity options for low-income persons and people of color. Private fair housing efforts should be expanded and coordinated with state fair housing initiatives. Special initiatives are needed to eliminate the “discrimination tax” that is levied on people of color homeowners. Similar efforts are also needed to protect small, disadvantaged, and minority businesses from this illegal tax. *Greenspace Development.* Promote greenspace development that promotes community cohesion, reduces crime, and improves mental health. Trees and greenspace need to be an integral part of all community planning since they increase the shade around buildings and parking lots, and lower air temperatures surrounding vegetation. *Energy Efficient Housing.* Improving energy efficiency in housing is a money saver and could play a major role in improving air quality. Reduction in energy consumption benefits all households. It is especially pertinent for low-income residents since efficiency measures save money, improve human health, reduce air pollution, increase building durability, and enhance property values. *Urban Brownfields Redevelopment.* Current land-use decision-making favors development in the suburbs or “greenfields” rather than inner city areas. Some policies foster abandonment and infrastructure decline. Alternatively, existing policies, such as criteria for funding water/sewer infrastructure could be modified to favor existing, rather than new development. In addition, “brownfields,” or abandoned or underutilized property or buildings, need to be reclaimed and brought back into production. Residents in neighborhoods with brownfields sites must be an integral part of the redevelopment process. *Change Zoning and Promote Transit-Oriented Development.* Change existing zoning codes to encourage multiuse land-development that makes it possible for people to walk, work, shop, and go to school within walking distance of their homes. Planners can shape land uses and development that are amenable to walking, bicycling, and transit use. Transit stations can become more than a place where commuters pass through on their way to somewhere else. Transit-oriented development (TOD) that promotes more dense mixed land uses. *Streets for Walking, Bicycles, and Transit.* Design communities around people rather than around automobiles. As a rule, sprawl development is not pedestrian, bicycle, or transit friendly. Infrastructure enhancements and service improvements are needed to get people out of their homes and cars. Walking and biking are two major travel modes that produce zero pollution. In addition, sidewalks, bike lanes, jogging paths all encourage physical activity, enhance public health, and promote social interaction and a sense of community. *Environmental Justice/Equity Analysis*. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) should demonstrate that their regional transportation plans comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which assure transportation investments promote greater equity in access to opportunities and economic benefits. The assessments will also need to address equity, environmental justice, and adequacy and appropriateness of current data, computer modeling capabilities, processes for assessing needs and developing projects, and use of performance measures. 8 *Improving Access to Jobs.* Sprawl-driven development diverts funds away from central cities. Improving low-income residents’ mobility, particularly for those making the transition from welfare to work, may be the difference between employment and unemployment. Innovative programs are needed to improve transportation efficiency, reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment, reduce the need for infrastructure investment, provide efficient access, examine development patterns and involve the community in such efforts. *Air Quality and Health.* Metropolitan Planning Organizations should incorporate social equity and environmental justice into air quality conformity requirements at all stages of the transportation planning process. It should also encourage the spending of congestion mitigation investments to benefit low-income communities and communities of color, especially if these areas exhibit disproportionately high levels of criteria pollutants. The U.S. DOT should work closely with the federal EPA and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to monitor air quality levels in nonattainment regions. *Public Health and Safety.* Fund research that examines the impact that changes in the built environment can have on public health, such as addition of greenspace, sidewalks, bike paths, lighting, crosswalks, traffic calming, etc. Target research funding to community based organizations (CBOs) and historically black colleges/minority institutions (HBCUs/MIs) to study and design remedies to address pedestrian fatalities and transportation safety issues in people of color communities. Finally, a national strategy is needed to develop and disseminate transportation equity and smart growth messages to the various people of color leaders, organizations, educational institutions, professional associations, fraternal orders, business associations, and other voluntary associations, i.e., church-based, civil rights, education, housing, community development, bankers, health care, legal, etc. People of color take ownership of the transportation equity and smart growth message, they will remain marginalized and on the periphery of the smart growth debate.

Solvency- Mechanism to Attain Equity

A collaborative effort by both the federal government and the citizens can create a coalition that can solve for the current notions of transportation that uniquely perpetuates injustice and creation of sprawls

Weir 01

 (Margaret Weir, Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago in 1986.  Her research and teaching fields include American political development, urban politics and policy, political sociology, and comparative studies of the welfare state, “METROPOLITAN COALITION-BUILDING STRATEGIES” DM)

Proclaiming that “we are all in it together,” urban advocates have for the past decade sought to promote city-suburban political coalitions.1 Their call for concerted regional action to address urban social and economic problems reflects a new political reality: the sharp scaling back of federal urban aid since the 1980s, even as concentrated urban poverty continued to grow. As federal dollars grew more scarce and social policy devolution granted states more discretion over spending, the need to gain new allies and to build power in new arenas became increasingly evident to many urban advocates. The call for metropolitan alliances also reflects a long underappreciated economic reality: the economic fate of cities and suburbs are linked. A wealth of studies now documents the interdependence of cities and suburbs.2 Many of these studies argue that all nonpoor suburbs have a long-term interest in reducing urban poverty because such poverty depresses regional economic growth. Others point to the shared economic interests of cities and particular suburbs, especially fiscally distressed suburbs. Despite this outpouring of research, identifying the “we” and figuring out how to get them together has proven challenging. Efforts to build equity-oriented metropolitan alliances have faced a formidable array of obstacles. These include longstanding political animosities between cities and suburbs, bitter racial divisions, entrenched administrative practices, and the narrow and short-term perspective that dominates the thinking of politicians and civic organizations in cities as well as suburbs. Yet, in metropolitan regions across the country, urban advocates have been building new alliances of varying reach and durability. This paper evaluates what we can learn from these efforts, drawing particularly on case material related to improving infrastructure and investment in low-income communities.3 I highlight four factors that appear consistently in successful and durable collaborations for reducing metropolitan inequalities. The first is the central role of relationship building among coalition members. The second is the ability to reframe problems so that formerly disparate interests find some common ground for collaborative action. The third is access to information and the capacity to analyze often complex data. The fourth is the ability to operate effectively in the multiple political arenas that span the federal system. After illustrating these factors, I then show how each of them has mattered for the development of specific metropolitan alliances. Finally, **effective influence at the state and federal levels is particularly important for most successful coalitions**, the last part of the paper shows how some Case material for this paper is draw from the secondary literature as well as from my own research, including interviews in Chicago and Washington D.C. with state legislators, city officials, advocates in the areas of transportation and community reinvestment, and other individuals notable metropolitan alliances have won access to those arenas. FOUR ELEMENTS OF DURABLE METROPOLITAN COLLABORATION Relationship-Building. Relationship-building is key to durable and successful collaborations. It is not only the first step, it is the central ongoing task of coalition-building. In efforts to build coalitions that cross metropolitan political boundaries or that stretch across a state, advocates in the same broad field may not know one another. When coalitions seek to unite groups active in different issue areas, the problem is compounded. Most research on relationship-building emphasizes the importance of repeated interactions in building trust.4 Small steps that link different groups in common actions are an essential part of the process. In addition to these close ties among direct cooperators, members of successful collaborations have knowledge of and access to more distant interests. Such “weak ties” can provide resources, knowledge or political support at critical moments. This suggests that it is well worth seeking out relationships with groups that have power or a reputation for power even if their immediate value to the coalition may not be evident. Organizations and coalitions use hiring decisions and member recruitment to extend the range of relationships. Defining Common Interests. Thinking about problems in regional terms does not come naturally to most metropolitan actors. Thinking is ways that link the interests of the urban poor to others in the metropolitan area is even more rare. Political boundaries promote narrow and local perspectives on regional problems. Many suburban residents look to their city boundaries as a form of protection from urban problems; for many localities, strengthening these boundaries has long been a central goal. Local politicians, driven by short-term electoral considerations and hot-button racial issues, often reinforce such narrow perspectives. Despite the continuing power of these barriers to collaboration, there are several processes through which groups within metropolitan areas can build common perspectives. The search for such areas of agreement does not imply complete overlap of agendas across groups or even similar motivations. Groups can begin to cooperate even around small areas of agreement. One approach to defining common interests involves what sociologists call the “strategic framing” of issues. Frames can be defined as “the specific metaphors, symbolic representations and cognitive cues” that define the issue.5 What is the issue about and whose interests does it touch? Investigators who study social movements point to the importance of framing in determining the scope and ultimately the success of social movements. Strategic framing can seek to redefine an issue so that groups who did not see their interests as intertwined find new bases of cooperation. The movement for “smart growth with equity” attempts such a redefinition of interests.6 The aim is to unite advocates for low-income communities with environmentalists and other potential allies, including business and labor. The interests of environmentalists and advocates for low-income communities have historically been difficult to reconcile.7 The anti-growth perspective of many environmental groups clashed with the support for jobs and growth on the part of urban advocates. More recently, advocates for low-income people and environmentalists have tangled directly over growth controls and affordable housing. The smart growth movement attempts to locate common ground among these groups. Environmentalists’ concerns about sprawl need to be addressed through revitalizing declining urban neighborhoods and providing affordable housing as part of revitalization. Portland, Oregon, which implemented state land use controls nearly 30 years ago, is widely acknowledged as the leader developing this kind of coalition. A similar logic is at work in recent efforts in Illinois to link environmental groups primarily concerned with stopping highway development with urban groups that support improved public transportation. A second way in which common interests can be built is when antagonistic groups learn through experience that their interests are at least partly complementary. The role of the Community 6 Reinvestment Act (CRA) in making banks realize there was a profit to be made in lending to low and moderate income home buyers provides an example of this process. First enacted in 1977, the CRA is an anti-redlining measure that required banks to lend throughout the areas from which they draw deposits. Although many banks vigorously resisted the measure and regulators failed to enforce it, in cities where local community-based organizations were strong, the CRA sparked collaborations that proved profitable to banks.8 By the 1990s, most banks had established community affairs departments and had discovered that it was indeed in their interest to lend to low and moderate income communities. Some initial coercion or regulation may be necessary to promote this kind of learning. For example, Oregon’s homebuilding industry initially opposed the state’s land use regulations but once they were in place, some of the builders came to support the law. A third way that low income advocates can win regional allies is by persuading regional organizations to extend their mission to encompass issues of highest concern to low-income communities. In many cases, this does not entail redefining interests, but rather broadening the action agenda. The American Lung Association’s increased attention to the asthma of inner city children provides an example of this kind of mission extension. The advantage of this strategy is that it does not require creating new organizations but rather extending the capacities of existing organizations. The emergence of new problems can provide an opportunity for redefining problems and identifying new allies. The past five years of economic growth have prompted business leaders in many regions to see sprawl, transportation, and the spatial mismatch between jobs and housing as problems that concern them. In some regions, such as Chicago, this has generated new business initiatives centrally concerned with promoting regional equity.9 In other settings, advocates have to press to ensure that equity considerations enter into business thinking about regionalism. Information and Expertise. Information and expertise are essential components of regional coalition- building strategies. They are particularly important in launching new policy initiatives because data can help cast issues in a new light, either documenting the extent of a problem or highlighting common interests that may not be apparent on the surface. Data and expertise can show that some solutions are more feasible than previously thought. Data can also highlight patterns of public spending that fail to Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) of 1975, which required banks to disclose the geographic location of their residential lending. The availability of that information, combined with new data disclosure requirements after 1989, was essential to showing patterns of noncompliance with the CRA. Disclosure requirements are not always sufficient to make data useful. Lending data was initially released in a form that made it difficult to use; only concerted pressure produced a more useable format. Although the Transportation Equity Act of 1998 (TEA-21) required the federal government to release data about public spending on transportation, local advocates have thus far found the data difficult to use to document unequal geographic patterns of spending. Even when data is available in a useful format, community organizations may not have the capacity to analyze it. Because of these difficulties, intermediary organizations that specialize in analyzing data are often critical components of regional coalitions. These organizations can build the expertise and invest in the computer equipment and software needed to analyze often complex data. In the field of community reinvestment, organizations such as the Woodstock Institute, the National Training and Information Center, and the National Community Reinvestment Coalition have played an essential role by providing analyses of local bank lending patterns for community groups. Such analyses are necessary for any plausible challenge to lending practices. More recently, these intermediary groups have also played a key role in state campaigns to regulate the latest predatory lending practices. In addition to analyzing data, intermediary organizations can produce new information. Using a variety of strategies, including surveys, new information is often a critical first step to documenting a address or even exacerbate some problems. The increase in home mortgage lending would not have been possible without the Home 9 common problem. New technologies have made information more valuable in organizing new coalitions. The development of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping is a particularly valuable tool. In his book Metropolitics Myron Orfield stresses the key role that large colored maps played in visually displaying the common interests among the elements of the metropolitan coalition he sought to build in the Twin Cities.10 Visual evidence of the common tax burden that the cities and some suburbs bore for the development of “executive suburbs” was powerful way to show doubtful suburbs that they had common fiscal interests with the city. In some cities, local intermediary organizations, such as Chicago’s Metropolitan Chicago Information Center now can provide local organizations access to these tools. Creating intermediaries that local organizations can access is itself a process requiring organization. The most successful uses of information occur when a supra local network of organizations is built to address similar problems. Such networks facilitate sharing information as well as strategy. Multi-level Political Action. Then notion of“ metropolitan collaboration” implies that action is confined to one level of government. The word “collaboration” implies a conflict-free process. Yet, successful regional collaborations have the ability to influence policy at the federal and state levels; they also possess sufficient political power to deploy more conflict-oriented approaches when necessary. Even in an era of significant policy devolution, federal regulations significantly affect the prospects for metropolitan collaborations. In many policy areas, federal regulations set the framework for metropolitan action. They can tilt the balance of power among local actors in ways that give weaker groups a foot in the door. For example, regulations regarding disclosure of information (as in the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act) and regulations requiring bank compliance (as in the Community Reinvestment Act) dramatically changed the balance of power between banks and community organizations. Federal actions can create new arenas of decision making that shake up existing power relationships, as in the 1992 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA gave more authority and discretion over spending decisions to Metropolitan Planning Organizations in hopes of curbing the power of state highway departments. Federal provisions can provide new channels of funding as in TEA-21's Access to Jobs program, which gave community groups a direct stake in regional initiatives to insert equity concerns in transportation decisions. Access to state politics is particularly important for creating and sustaining regional alliances. Because there are very few regional organizations with significant decision making power, most key regional decisions actually get made at the state level. The entrenched localism of much decision making in the states and the salience of partisan divisions has made this a particularly tough arena for promoting city-suburb coalitions. State-wide campaigns supported by a wide array of local groups – often united by only thin agreement, rather than deep common interest – may be the best strategy for prevailing in state politics.

Disabilities Add On

Current Mass Transit is only accessible to a limited population, people with disabilities are often left behind without any access to transportation

Laskow 2k12

(Sarah Laskow, Reporter at Good Environment, “Public Transportation Systems Are Leaving People With Disabilities Behind” May 10th 2012)

To use New York City's [paratransit service](http://www.mta.info/nyct/paratran/guide.htm)—the on-demand public transportation system for people who can’t use the bus or the subway system—a customer must call one to two days in advance, between the hours of 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. She can request a pickup time or submit an appointment time by which she must reach her destination, but not both. The driver will pick her up anywhere from 30 minutes before to 30 minutes after the agreed-upon time. If anything changes, the customer must call three hours in advance to cancel the trip. That’s more hassle than most people would put up with to visit a doctor or have dinner at a restaurant or go to the store. And that’s how the system is supposed to work. Before the Americans with Disabilities Act passed more than 20 years ago, there was no guarantee that public transit would serve disabled people at all. The **ADA required paratransit service as a supplement to public transportation systems, as well as increased access on regular public transit routes for people with disabilities. But advocates for disabled people are still fighting for better transportation options.** [**At last count**](http://www.bts.gov/programs/omnibus_surveys/targeted_survey/2002_national_transportation_availability_and_use_survey/)**, there were 2 million people with disabilities in the United States who never leave their homes. More than a quarter—560,000 people—say that's because of transportation difficulties**. The American Association of People with Disabilities notes [in a new report](http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf) that only 20 percent of Amtrak stations have complied with ADA standards. Major subway systems are only required to make “key” stations accessible. And for people with disabilities—particularly those who use wheelchairs—taxis are rarely an option. In New York City, for example, only 233 of more than 13,000 taxis are wheelchair-accessible, less than 2 percent of the city’s taxi fleet. The nonprofit Disability Rights Advocates brought a lawsuit against the city, which controls the taxi fleet through a licensing system, demanding that number be increased. [Late last year](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/12/24/nyc-taxi-agency-must-help_n_1168879.html), a district judge ruled that city must create a comprehensive plan for providing taxi service to the disabled.  New York is in the middle of designing the “[Taxi of Tomorrow](http://www.nyc.gov/html/media/totweb/taxioftomorrow_home.html),” a fuel-efficient cab decked out with USB ports and other luxuries. At one point, it looked like these cabs might be wheelchair-accessible, but the Mayor’s office wasn’t [particularly interested](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/02/john-liu-pledges-to-rejec_n_1471740.html?ref=new-york) in prioritizing that. Now, Comptroller John Liu (a likely candidate in next year’s mayoral election) says he’ll block the taxi contract unless all new cabs can accommodate wheelchairs.  Part of the reason it’s so difficult for public transit system to serve people with disabilities is that they’re woefully underfunded. It’s important that cities make it possible for people to get around without cars in order to create dense neighborhoods and keep pollution down. But it’s also important that those systems don’t leave people with disabilities stranded in their homes or on a street corner, unable to get where they need to go.

And this has severe implications on their daily lives as they are constrained to live in one place and unable to move from place to place

Golledge et al 1996 (Reginald G. Golledge, PhD in geography and works at University of California, C. Michael Costanzo, and James R. Marston, also professors at University of California. “The Mass Transit Needs of a Non-Driving Disabled Population”. This work was performed as part of the California PATH Program of the University of California, in cooperation with the State of California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, Department of Transportation; and the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.)

The 1992 World Almanac recently revealed that approximately sixty-seven percent of the United States population are drivers. There is no doubt that the ability to drive and the freedom that it gives with respect to economic and social interactions are seen as a tremendously important parts of the American way of life. Non-driving disabled people are not able to enjoy this facet of everyday existence. They must face a range of problems starting with the frustrations of trying to arrange transportation, to battling the beliefs that they are imposing on people's time, to resigning themselves to missed appointments or interactions when arranged transportation does not arrive in time or at all, to being unaware if they are standing at a bus stop as to whether a bus has already departed or is still on its way, to facing a host of problems concerned with being able to get to sites of recreation, shopping, work, or social interaction, in a convenient and non- dependent or non-threatening way. Certainly, having a driver's license gives one the sense that one is in control of the decision process concerning where one can go, when one can go, and how one can get there. It is, in fact, an extraordinarily integral part of time budgeting in all daily and longer term episodic patterns in the USA. While congenitally blind non-drivers can never be truly aware of the potential freedoms that they could have if they were drivers, those adventitiously blinded (i.e., blinded in life after having had vision for some time), are deeply and disturbingly aware of the sudden contraction of their activity spaces and the entire range of their social interactions. The question that arises is, how do they compensate for this loss? For some, family, relatives, friends, or work-mates fill the gap to a reasonable and acceptable extent. Others seek to minimize a felt dependence on others (i.e., in the form of constantly asking for help). Some turn to mass transportation alternatives to solve their travel problems, but this number is far short of what it could be. Others simply turn off and stay at home for they do not feel strong enough or confident enough to become dependent on others or to learn how to use mass transportation systems not designed for them. Thus, it is patently obvious that undertaking research on people's feelings and attitudes towards the problem of movement, and uncovering the frustrations and dependencies that are part and parcel of everyday life for the disabled non-driver, should provide us with clear insights into what is missing from the current state of the art in terms of provision of transportation services for this population. It is necessary to know if these frustrations and dependencies can be reduced by a more effective use of existing mass transportation systems, or whether only new modes of movement can deal with this problem. Solving this question becomes paramount in the attempt to try to define how it is possible to preserve autonomy and dignity in non-driving disabled populations and to help them avoid social isolation. Over four hundred cities nationwide provide mass transportation or specialized transportation that is supposed to be accessible to disabled people. Not all deal with questions of physical or other impairments in a similar way (i.e., user habits learned for one system do not necessarily transfer to systems in other environments. The way that each population has to deal with existing mass transportation systems has a significant impact on the way they are able to operate and live their life on a daily basis.

Movements Add On

Mass Transit is a perquisite to sparking movements. Only these movements can effectively dismantle environmental racism, empirics prove: Executive Order 12898 was passed due to grassroots movements started by community activist.

Bullard et al 04

(Robert Bullard and Glenn Johnson, Ware Professor of Sociology and the director of the Environmental Justice resources at Clark Atlanta University 5-8)

In the real world, all communities are not created equal. All communities do not receive equal protection. Economics, political clout, and race play an important part in sorting out residential amenities and disamenities. Racism is alive and well in the United States (Doob, 1993). Environmental racism is as real as the racism found in housing, employment, education, and voting (Bullard, 1993a). Environmental racism refers to any environmental policy, practice, or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) indi- viduals, groups, or communities based on race or color. Environmental racism is one form of environmental injustice and is reinforced by government, legal, eco- nomic, political, and military institutions. Environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for Whites while shifting costs to people of color (Bullard, 1993a; Collin, 1992; Colquette & Robertson, 1991; Godsil, 1990). The impetus behind the environmental justice movement did not come from within government, academia, or largely White, middle-class, nationally based environmental and conservation groups. The impetus for change came from people of color, grassroots activists, and their “bottom-up” leadership approach. Grass- roots groups organized themselves, educated themselves, and empowered them- selves to make fundamental change in the way environmental protection is administered in their communities. Government has been slow to ask the questions of who gets help and who does not, who can afford help and who cannot, why some contaminated communities get studied whereas others get left off the research agenda, why industry poisons some communities and not others, why some contaminated communities get cleaned up whereas others do not, why some populations are protected and others are not protected, and why unjust, unfair, and illegal policies and practices are allowed to go unpunished. Struggles for equal environmental protection and environmental justice did not magically appear in the 1990s. Many communities of color have been engaged in life-and-death struggles for more than a decade. In 1990, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) held a historic conference in Atlanta. The ATSDR National Minority Health Conference focused on contamination (Johnson, Williams, & Harris, 1992). In 1992, after meeting with community lead- ers, academicians, and civil rights leaders, the EPA (under the leadership of William Reilly) acknowledged there was a problem and established the Office of Environmental Equity (the name was changed to the Office of Environmental Justice under the Clinton administration). In 1992, the EPA produced one of the first comprehensive documents to examine the whole question of risk, environmental hazards and their equity: *Envi- ronmental Equity: Reducing Risk for All Communities* (U.S. EPA, 1992a). The report and the resulting Office of Environmental Equity were initiated only after prodding from people of color, environmental justice leaders, activists, and a few academicians. In 1993, EPA also established a 25-member National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The NEJAC is comprised of stakeholders representing grassroots community groups; environmental groups; nongovernmental organizations; state, local, and tribal governments; academia; and industry. The NEJAC divides its environmental jus- tice work into six subcommittees: Health and Research, Waste and Facility Siting, Enforcement, Public Participation and Accountability, Native American and Indigenous Issues, and International Issues. InFebruary1994,sevenfederalagencies,includingtheATSDR,theNational Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, the EPA, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Energy (DOE), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention sponsored a national health symposium, “Health and Research Needs to Ensure Environmental Justice,” in Arlington, Virginia. The conference planning committee was unique in that it included grassroots organization leaders, residents of affected communities, and federal agency representatives. The goal of the February conference was to bring diverse stakeholders and those most affected to the decision-making table (National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, 1995). Recommendations from the symposium included the following: Conduct meaningful health research in support of people of color and low-income communities. Promote disease prevention and pollution prevention strategies. Promote interagency coordination to ensure environmental justice. Provide effective outreach, education, and communications. Design legislative and legal remedies. In response to growing public concern and mounting scientific evidence, President Bill Clinton on February 11, 1994 (the second day of the national health symposium), issued Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Envi- ronmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” This order attempts to address environmental injustice within existing federal laws and regulations. Executive Order 12898 reinforces the 35-year-old Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI, which prohibits discriminatory practices in programs receiving federal funds. The order also focuses the spotlight on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a 25-year-old law that set policy goals for the protection, mainte- nance, and enhancement of the environment. NEPA’s goal is to ensure for all Americans a safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing environment. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare a detailed statement on the environmental effects of proposed federal actions that significantly affect the quality of human health (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997). The order calls for improved methodologies for assessing and mitigating impacts and health effects from multiple and cumulative exposure and collection of data on low-income and minority populations who may be disproportionately at risk and impacts on subsistence fishers and wildlife consumers. It also encourages participation of the affected populations in the various phases of assessing impacts, including scoping, data gathering, alternatives, analysis, mitigation, and monitoring. The order focuses on “subsistence” fishers and wildlife consumers. Not every- one buys the fish they consume at the supermarket. There are many people who are subsistence fishers, who fish for protein, who basically subsidize their budgets, and their diets, by fishing from rivers, streams, and lakes that happen to be polluted. These subpopulations may be underprotected when basic assumptions are made using the dominant risk paradigm.

Effective mass transit system is key to spurring movements. These movements are key to eliminating environmental injustice in the status quo

Mann et al 2006. (Eric Mann, Kikanza Ramsey, Barbara Lott-Holland, and Geoff Ray are members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center an organization that has a particular focus on civil rights, environmental justice, public health, global warming, and the criminal legal system.. “An Environmental Justice Strategy for Urban Transportation”. http://urbanhabitat.org/files/ 1%20Eric%20Mann.pdf).

Across the United States, federal and state transportation funds favor suburban commuters and auto owners at the cost of the urban poor, the working class, the lowest income communities of color, the elderly, high school students, and the disabled. People dependent on public transit for their transportation needs suffer dilapidated buses, long waits, longer rides, poor connections, service cuts, overcrowding, and daily exposure to some of the worst tail-pipe toxins. The movement for first-class, regional transportation systems that give priority to the transitdependent requires the mobilization of those excluded and marginalized from politics-as-usual, and will challenge the pro-corporate consensus. Equity demands a mass movement of funds from the highway and rail interests to bus systems, from suburban commuters, corporate developers, and rail contractors to the urban working class of color. Such a transformation will not happen—cannot happen— until a mass movement of the transit-dependent is built from the bottom up. A Transit Strategy for the Transit-Dependent In 1993, the Labor/Community Strategy Center (LCSC) in Los Angeles founded the Bus Riders Union (BRU)—now the largest multi-racial grassroots transportation group in the U.S.—with more than 3,000 members representing the roughly 400,000 daily bus riders. The BRU’s 12 years of organizing, significant policy and legal victories, and analytical and theoretical expertise can be used as a resource for the urgent work of mass transit reconstruction in U.S. urban communities. The needs and the leadership capacity of the urban working class of color must play a central role in developing sustainable communities. We must aim to: reduce suburban sprawl; promote ecological and environmental public health; create non-racist public policy; and focus on the transportation needs of society’s most oppressed and exploited. The needs of the working class and communities of color are both an end in themselves and an essential building block of any effective organizing plan. The transit-dependent are defined as those who depend on public transportation for their mobility and personal viability because of income (unable to afford the purchase or maintenance of a car), age (too young or too old to drive), or disability. It is the lowwage workers, the people of color, the elderly, the high school students, and the disabled who must be at the center of any viable transit strategy. The deterioration of urban public transportation is racially coded and must be addressed with an explicitly anti-racist perspective. In every major urban area in the United States, the low-wage workforce is at the center of the region’s political economy—the domestic, department store, convenience store, electronic assembly, garment, hotel, and restaurant workers, the security guards, and the street vendors. These workers often have children, rent apartments rather than own homes, use public transportation, and have family incomes of $15,000 to $20,000 a year. Everything they do—transporting children to and from schools and childcare facilities; going to work; looking for work; attending community colleges; even enjoying modest forms of recreation— depends upon a viable public transportation system. Public Health vs. Culture of the Automobile Any serious movement that prioritizes public health over corporate profit, especially with regard to toxins and air pollution, must draw some very radical political and policy conclusions. As Barry Commoner, the noted environmental scientist, observed, the only effective way to radically reduce airborne toxins is to ban them before they are produced. With regard to the internal combustion engine and the auto industry, it would be best if there were the most stringent restrictions on auto emissions, combined with some radical restrictions on auto use. The problem is that there can be no effective mass movement to drastically reduce fossil fuel and automobile usage until there is a well-developed public transportation system. This brings us up against the legendary automobile/highway lobby, and something else: the deeply ingrained culture of the automobile, which cuts across every social and economic class in this society, not just the white, middle-class suburbanites. Unfortunately, the car culture has won the hearts and minds of many low-income people, including Blacks and Latinos. Given the centuries of housing segregation and discrimination, it is not surprising that a fancy car has become one of the few attainable symbols of status and upward mobility in communities of color. This cultural attachment can only be challenged if the public transportation system can at least meet the people’s transit needs as efficiently as the car. Public Health vs. Corporate Science If organizers are indeed successful in using public health arguments to challenge the cultural obsession with the automobile, we will still be faced with overcoming the corporate counter-attack on public health science. In the debate about air toxins, corporate ‘scientists’ have shown themselves to be masters of the art of obfuscation and sometimes, outright lying. It is generally agreed that most criteria pollutants and air toxins take years, or even decades, to generate cancers and other diseases. But that is all the more reason to restrict their production in the present. However, organizers from impacted communities have found that approaching government regulatory agencies, such as the Air Quality Management District of Southern California (AQMD), and talking to them in common-sense public health terms— “your chemicals are killing me,” or “my daughter cannot breathe from the asthma,” or “if you know a chemical is carcinogenic, why do you produce it in the first place?”—gets them nowhere. The offending industries characteristically respond with a battery of scientists and lawyers arguing for multi-causality, meaning that the cancer or leukemia could have been caused by the chemical plant in question, or an oil refinery down the road, or any of the many known carcinogens in our air and water. They may have debates about actual exposure levels (“We acknowledge emitting known carcinogens into the air but we cannot be sure that your daughter was directly exposed to those emissions”) and dosage levels—reflected in parts per million and even cancers per million! They may acknowledge the link between benzene and leukemia, but will deny that the benzene emissions from their cars is sufficient to cause leukemia, just as cigarette companies argued that their products are neither addictive nor deadly. To spend a day dealing with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the AQMD, or any other similar agency, is to feel a sense of futility and exhaustion. It is as if the people are on trial and have to carry the burden of proof even as the system asserts that known polluters and carcinogens are innocent until proven guilty. Over the years, however, we have found that public health education is a powerful organizing tool. Low-income residents come to enjoy the science as much as anyone else, and they enjoy challenging corporate science. They understand that a social movement, while rooted in passion and direct experience, can be greatly strengthened by a little knowledge of anatomy, physiology, toxicology, and epidemiology. The victory of the Bus Riders Union in forcing the MTA to abide by its clean-fuel standards and drop its plans to purchase diesel buses is a positive example of grassroots science defeating corporate science in the arena of public policy and public debate. Transportation Justice Demands A comprehensive list of demands for a renewed transportation justice movement will be long, but following the successful Future of Transportation organizing conference in Los Angeles this year, we currently see the following as central to any serious movement. Low-priced public transportation— 24/7 A common complaint across the country is that urban and rural bus systems are coming undone at the seams but the government continues to fund the insatiable highway lobby (80% of all federal funds) and boondoggle rail projects. At $200 million per mile for ‘light rail’ and $350 million per mile for subways—in construction costs alone—these projects generate constant budget deficits. This in turn leads to massive fare increases and service cuts in urban and rural bus systems all over the United States and Canada, forcing low-income people to fall back on unreliable, gas-guzzling, often uninsured cars. What is needed instead is aptly expressed by the chant: “We need a 50-cent fare/and $20 passes/mass transportation/ belongs to the masses.” A clean fuel, bus-centered mass transit system As a model, the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union plan proposes the deployment of 600 buses and 50 community jitneys, covering hundreds of miles and hundreds of thousands of riders, for a $1.5 billion price tag, which includes capital and operating costs. This plan is in sharp contrast to the typical ‘light rail’, which covers six to eight miles and serves no more than 15,000 riders for the same price. The efforts of the rail lobbyists to characterize the Riders Union and other civil rights groups as “narrow and protest-based” (read Black, Latino, Asian, female, and low-income, as opposed to the white, suburban, privileged, car-riding constituencies who supposedly embody the “broader” view) can easily be repudiated. Plus, a growing number of transit planners are coming around to accepting the idea that replacing automobiles on the existing highways and surface streets with a clean fuel, bus-centered, rapid transit system, is the way to go. Paying attention to dirty-atsource clean fuels As Clayton Thomas-Muller from the Indigenous Environmental Network has pointed out, many clean fuels, such as compressed natural gas and hydrogen, are very dirty at the source. There are growing violations of Indigenous peoples’ sovereignty and impacts on public health from coal mining, oil exploration, the extraction of natural gas, and other ‘dirty-atsource’ energy schemes. We need less energy altogether and a focus on truly renewable energy sources. We need to place public health and the survival of Third World nations at the center of our U.S. environmental organizing work. The U.S., with just six percent of the world’s population, consumes and abuses 25 percent of the world’s resources. We need a radical restriction of this toxic lifestyle, beginning with a major challenge to the auto industry. As nations around the world face devastating extreme weather events, we have to take this message to the Black, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Indigenous communities, as well as the white middle-class and workingclass communities: the future of the planet is at stake. Mass Transit: The Heart of the New Revolution Transportation is a great multifaceted issue around which to build a movement, because it touches so many aspects of people’s lives. Transportation affects public health, access to jobs, childcare, housing, medical care, education, and more. It is inextricably tied to the history of the civil rights movement now and in the past. Now it has taken on a life and death urgency because of the public health crisis and global warming brought on by the automobile. Public transportation can be a great unifier—bringing together people of all races and classes who seek a saner, healthier world in which wars for oil and energy are exposed and opposed.

Only through grassroots action can truly dismantle the current problems surrounding environmental racism

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “CONFRONTING ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE: IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO” DM)

The impetus behind the environmental justice movement did not come from within government, academia, or from within largely white middle-class nationally-based environmental and conservation groups. The impetus for change came from people of color grassroots activists and their "bottom-up" leadership approach. Grassroots groups organized themselves, educated themselves, and empowered themselves to make fundamental change in the way environmental protection is performed in their communities. The environmental justice movement has come a long ways since its humble beginning in rural, predominately African American Warren County, North Carolina where a PCB landfill ignited protests and over 500 arrests. The Warren County protests provided the impetus for a U.S. General Accounting Office (1983) study, Siting of Hazardous Waste Landfills and Their Correlation with Racial and Economic Status of Surrounding Communities. That study revealed that three out of four of the off-site, commercial hazardous waste landfills in Region 4 (which comprises eight states in the South) happen to be located in predominantly African-American communities, although African-Americans made up only 20% of the region's population. In 1997, both of the operating commercial offsite hazardous waste landfills in the region are located in mostly African American communities. The protests also led the Commission for Racial Justice (1987) to produce Toxic Waste and Race, the first national study to correlate waste facility sites and demographic characteristics. Race was found to be the most potent variable in predicting where these facilities were located -- more powerful than poverty, land values, and home ownership. In 1990, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality chronicled the convergence of two social movements -- social justice and environmental movements -- into the environmental justice movement (Bullard 1990). This book highlighted African-Americans environmental activism in the South, the same region that gave birth to the modern civil rights movement. What started out as local and often isolated community-based struggles against toxics and facility siting blossomed into a multi-issue, multi-ethnic, and multi-regional movement. The 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit was probably the most important single event in the movement's history. The Summit broadened the environmental justice movement beyond its anti-toxics focus to include issues of public health, worker safety, land use, transportation, housing, resource allocation, and community empowerment (Lee 1992). The meeting, organized by and for people of color, **demonstrated that it is possible to build a multi-racial grassroots movement around environmental and economic justice** (Alston, 1992). Held in Washington, DC, the four-day Summit was attended by over 650 grassroots and national leaders from around the world. Delegates came from all fifty states including Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Chile, Mexico, and as far away as the Marshall Islands. People attended the Summit to share their action strategies, redefine the environmental movement, and develop common plans for addressing Environmental problems affecting people of color in the United States and around the world (Alston and Brown 1993). On October 27, 1991, Summit delegates adopted 17 "Principles of Environmental Justice." These principles were developed as a guide for organizing, networking, and relating to government and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). By June 1992, Spanish and Portuguese translations of the Principles were used and circulated by NGOs and community groups at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. Federal, state, and local policies and practices have contributed to residential segmentation and unhealthy living conditions in poor, working class, and people of color communities (Bullard and Johnson 1997). Several recent California cases bring this point to life (Lee 1995). Disparate highway siting and mitigation plans were challenged by community residents, churches, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Clean Air Alternative Coalition v. United States Department of Transportation (N.D. Cal. C-93-0721-VRW), involving the reconstruction of the earthquake damaged Cypress Freeway in West Oakland. The plaintiffs wanted the damaged Cypress Freeway (which split their community in half) rebuilt further away. Although the plaintiffs were not able to get their plan implemented, they did change the course of the freeway in their out of court settlement. The NAACP LDF filed an administrative complaint, Mothers of East Los Angeles, El Sereno Neighborhood Action Committee, El Sereno Organizing Committee, et al. v. California Transportation Commission, et al. (before the U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S. Housing and Urban Development), challenging the construction of the 4.5 extension of the Long Beach Freeway in East Los Angeles through El Sereno, Pasadena, and South Pasadena. The plaintiffs argue that the state agencies proposes mitigation measures to address noise, air and visual pollution discriminate against the mostly Latino El Sereno community. For example, all of the freeway in Pasadena and 80 percent in South Pasadena will be below ground level. On the other hand, most of the freeway in El Sereno will be above ground. White areas were favored over the mostly Latino El Sereno in allocation of covered freeway, historic preservation measures, and accommodation to local schools (Lee 1995; Bullard and Johnson 1997). Los Angeles residents and the NAACP LDF have also challenged the inequitable funding and operation of bus transportation used primarily by low-income and people of color residents. A class action lawsuit was filed on behalf of 350,000 low-income, people of color, bus riders represented by the Labor/Community Strategy Center, the Bus Riders Union, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates, and individual bus riders. In Labor/Community Strategy Center v. Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Cal. CV 94-5936 TJH Mcx)), the plaintiffs argue that the MTA has used federal funds to pursue a policy of raising costs of bus riders (who are mostly poor and people of color) and reducing quality of service in order to fund rail and other projects in predominately white, suburban areas. In September, 1996, the Labor/Community Strategy Center and their lawyers won an historic out-of-court settlement against the MTA (Bullard and Johnson 1997).

2AC States

Lack of coordination and decision making power makes the states ineffective.

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Ware Professor of Sociology and the director of the Environmental Justice resources at Clark Atlanta University, “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism and New Routes To Equality: Building Transportation Equity into Smart Growth” 179-82)

Although ISTEA and TEA-21 have allowed the public to play a stronger role in the decision-making process, transforming the vision into reality largely depends on public resources and institutions for policy implementations. One barrier to advancing environmental justice is the lack of coordination between state and transportation departments, which program 94 percent of federal transportation funds, and local governments, which dominate land use decisions. MPO’s, which are governed by local elected officials, have directly controlled only 6 percent of federal transportation funds over the past twelve years and do not have authority over the land use. Both ISTEA and TEA-21 were designed to expire within six years unless they were updated and reauthorized. The landmark ISTEA law of 1991 was reauthorized as TEA-21 in 1998. Currently, TEA-21 is being reviewed for reauthorization. Through the next law, which is informally called TEA-3, Congress will determine key funding and programmatic decisions for the federal surface transportation program. Lawmakers will decide whether to defend and build upon the ISTEA and TEA-21 framework, potentially strengthening provisions for environmental justice, or to unravel key reforms still in their infancy. As TEA-21 reauthorization moves forward and after its passage, larger questions remain that are fundamental to transportation reform and environmental justice: What are “we the people” getting in return for public investment? Who benefits and who pays? And what policies can leverage transportation justice efforts at the national, state, and local level.

States cannot solve for environmental injustice because they are too concerned with highway funding, and no incentive to help the poor.

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Ware Professor of Sociology and the director of the Environmental Justice resources at Clark Atlanta University, “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism and New Routes To Equality: Building Transportation Equity into Smart Growth” 179-82)

Beyond the financial burden and disparate health impacts placed on communities of color and low-income communities, the auto-oriented transportation system also makes it more difficult to find and keep a good job. State and regional transportation priorities typically favor highway development over public transit, contributing to sprawling development at the expense of the urban core and leaving less funding available for transit. The lack of coordination between transportation, economic development, and housing decisions increases the cost of transit service delivery, making transit more difficult to finance. These costs are typically absorbed by local governments, despite shrinking tax bases, due to the restriction more than thirty states have on state-gas-taxes which can only be used on highway programs. Congestion relief and economic development goals drive most infrastructure investments research on induced travel however finds that new roadways attract almost equal levels of traffic growth due to building booms along new traffic corridors. A Maryland study on the relationship between highway investment and sprawl recently found that more than 90 percent of developed properties within five miles of a major interstate highway were built after the adjacent section of the highway was completed. As a result of this pattern, sprawl development has become the status quo in many parts of the country. The resulting “spatial mismatch” between jobs and housing concentrates high rates of poverty in the urban core and makes residential and economic development generated by new roads in outer suburbs virtually inaccessible by transit, foot, or bicycle. That lack of coordination between agencies compounds challenges facing transit-dependent communities. According to a recent survey, none of the fifty states consider public transportation availability when allocating state economic development subsidies. In fact, states encouraged the relocation of corporations from transit-accessible urban areas to auto dependent exurbs. The combination of policies that favor highway building and auto-dependent, and single-use development is especially detrimental because less funding is available for transit and transit becomes a more expensive service. Low- income and minority families are disproportionately affected by inadequate investment in transit since they are more likely to reside in urban communities and depend on transit to get around. Not only have jobs left the urban core where they live, but environmental justice communities in some instances have no way to get to the jobs in the exurbs.

Only the plan is key to solving for environmental injustice, any other risks a de-evaluation of environmental injustice

Bullard 04

(Robert Bullard, Ware Professor of Sociology and the director of the Environmental Justice resources at Clark Atlanta University, “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism and New Routes To Equality: Building Transportation Equity into Smart Growth” 179-82)

Increasing evidence indicates that minority and low-income communities are disproportionately burdened by the shortage of transportation choice that are affordable, environmentally clean, and competitive. The impacts of highway construction on the land use patters, including widespread disinvestment in urban areas, are also well known. Despite numerous statutes and regulations requiting federal, state, and metropolitan transportation agencies to determine and avoid adverse direct and cumulative impact on socioeconomic group, agencies do not systematically consider whether new highway investments and rail investments exclusive to affluent neighborhoods will worsen conditions in environmental justice communities. Greater transparency in transportation policy and finance is needed to ensure that all communities benefit. Environmental justice performance measures related to mobility, accessibility, public health, and economic development can better hardwire Title CI to the federal transportation program. One challenge, however is that although federal law calls for the strongest data and science to be used to determine disparate impact, US DOT does not collect, maintain, and analyze the information required to determine adverse impacts. And while the Supreme Court’s decision n *Alexander v. Sandoval* places a greater emphasis on intentional discrimination, to substantiate a Title VI complaint will still require statistical or anecdotal evidence of disparities.

2AC No Transition

This is false, people do not need to transition. The movement of the affirmative is critical to solving for environmental injustice and racism. Only by orienting a movement towards the state and transportation policies can we create a change.

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

The regulations that implemented TEA-21’s public involvement provision require that state departments of transportation and MPOs “seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems including but not limited to low- income and minority households.”214 Yet, greater efforts need to be made to increase participation levels of historically underrepresented populations. There are no procedures for reviewing whether state departments of transportation and MPOs are adequately implementing this requirement and, although the Federal Highway Administrator may withhold payment of funds to enforce this regulation, we are unaware of any situations in which this has happened.215 Increasing participation of minority and low-income communities in the state department of transportation planning process is particularly important because of the large scale of their projects and the amount of transportation funding they control. It is also more difficult for the same reasons. An FHWA report evaluating statewide long-range transportation plans examined the public involvement efforts described in 48 statewide plans. The report indicated that states varied widely in the points at which public participation was sought. Some states only sought input prior to the planning process and others sought input at multiple stages. Also, the methods employed by states to gain public input varied dramatically, with public meetings the most relied-upon means (44%) for obtaining public input. According to the report, New Mexico officials felt that public meetings only attract those already familiar with the transportation planning process, and thus that state relied on focus groups of randomly selected citizens to help inform its planning process. The report did not indicate any specific efforts states made to ensure that they were obtaining input from minority or low-income households.216 One challenge facing MPOs is that many of their boards are overrepresented by suburban interests by virtue of a “one-area, one-vote” system. When district boundaries for MPO board representatives and planning units are drawn that result in approximately equal-sized geographic areas, urban core areas that have denser populations end up being underrepresented compared with suburban zones that have lower population densities.217 This system influences the level of public involvement and participation of persons based on residential location—and negatively so in the case of low-income, neighborhoods of color in urban core areas. Recent research suggests that MPO board and voting structures have a significant effect on the outcomes of transportation investment decisions—especially those related to public transit.218 Although specific information about the racial and ethnic composition of MPO boards has not been collected formally and comprehensively, it is likely that minorities are not appropriately represented on MPO boards. For example, the MPO for Montgomery, Alabama has no minorities on its board even though African Americans make up 40 percent of the local population. During the FHWA and FTA investigation of a challenge to the MPO certification, it was discovered that the MPO had a Citizen’s Advisory Committee in name only that had never been convened.219 In the Philadelphia area, there are 18 voting members and 22 alternates on the MPO board; only five are minorities, and of the 15 nonvoting members and their alternates, only three are minorities. Atlanta’s MPO has five minority members among 39 total board members. Detroit, with a population that is approximately 71 percent African American, has an MPO board whose main policies are set by a 46-member executive committee that is approximately 11 percent African American. Comprehensive collection of data on the composition of MPO boards would be useful in assessing levels of representation by race and ethnicity. Specific challenges remain in regard to greater public participation and involvement in transportation decision making by state departments of transportation and MPOs. Community- based groups that assist transportation agencies should be encouraged to improve outreach processes and strategies to identify culturally diverse groups and facilitate their involvement. In addition, these efforts are greatly needed to support the information dissemination about transportation and related land use impacts. Organizations such as the Transportation Equity Network of the Center for Community Change220 and the Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities—a national organization supporting philanthropic organizations working to advance social equity, create better economies, build livable communities, and protect and preserve natural resources—advocate for broadening the base of community organizing around issues of smart growth and social and environmental justice.221 Mechanisms are needed that allow formal recognition of these coalitions as community representatives on MPO advisory committees and decision-making boards. In addition, MPOs, local governments, researchers, and community-based organizations need funds for more data collection and analysis about transportation access to basic needs such as health care, jobs, affordable housing, and public education.222 Although state departments of transportation currently control the vast majority of transportation decisions, MPOs play an important role in shaping transportation policies that affect significant populations of minorities and low-income individuals. Both of these agencies can play an increasingly important role in achieving social equity by addressing transportation equity issues through the broad view of social exclusion. Transportation service provision, the consequences of interaction between land use and transportation decisions, and issues of spatial equity are best addressed on a regional basis and at appropriate stages in the planning process. Although regional challenges can be addressed incrementally with localized solutions, the overall set of factors affecting travel supply and demand occurs at the regional level—where land use patterns and transportation efficiency intersect. Regional perspectives can facilitate a more comprehensive approach to questions of social equity.

2AC Racism CP

Providing mass transit is the first step in solving for racism. No net benefit to the counter plan

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

TEA-21, which directs more than $200 billion in transportation funding to states and communities and determines how these funds may be used, will expire on September 30, 2003. The reauthorization of the act provides Congress with an enormous opportunity to incorporate provisions that will meaningfully address travel issues and concerns of minority and low-income communities across the nation. The following are some recommendations that follow from the issues raised in the report and from what we know from existing research. Implementation of these recommendations would help address the racial injustices created by transportation policies across the country and advance the national—and constitutional—goal of equality. 1. Increase funding for public transportation, and develop new programs and support existing programs that improve minorities’ mobility. Public transportation is a public service that should be supported. Also, support programs focusing on the needs of low- income and minority transit users to provide reliable connections to job sites and other necessary destinations. For example, the Job Access and Reverse Commute programs support a number of promising efforts to connect low-wage workers to jobs and services, but additional funding is needed to examine which of these efforts are most effective and most likely to be successfully replicated. Also, a handful of significant research identifies increased access to cars as having a positive impact on the ability of minorities to gain access to and retain employment, which suggests that pilot programs that help low-income minorities access cars when public transit is inadequate should be developed.

2AC PIC (Busses)

1. Limiting words precludes social change

SCHRAM 95

(Sanford F. SCHRAM, Associate Professor of Political Science at Macalester College, former Visiting Professor at the La Follette Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin and Visiting Affiliate at the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin,1995 “Discourses of Dependency: The Politics of Euphemism,” Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and The Social Science of Poverty, Published by The University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0816625778, p. 34-35 DM)

The politics of renaming highlights the relationships of discourse to structure and ideology to power.87 The limits of euphemisms suggest that these renamings often reinforce a broader, institutionalized, and structural context that is supported through the daily actions of aligned groupings exercising power to effect outcomes consistent with their interests. Yet the power plays reinforcing prevailing structures also operate to encourage selected interpretations of a wide variety of acts of signification. These structures help create a “social logic” that constrains interpretation of even the most imaginative of renamings. Whereas the structural conditions that constrain policy discourse are themselves discursively constituted, they in turn produce [end page 34] material constraints that limit notions of what is feasible and practical under the existing arrangements. Therefore, displacing the self-sufficiency of the “breadwinner” will not on its own make “dependents” more worthy. Even if “bread” itself is shown in good part, if not the whole loaf, to be symbolic, that will not by itself lead people to eat some other symbol. Gaining leverage for political change involves appreciating not just how material structures can be denaturalized. Political change comes with also appreciating how material practices serve to constrain seriously the extent to which discursive moves will have any tractability in public settings. Only when the power plays supporting such structural conditions are resisted can alternative discursive moves gain political salience.88 Action to improve the lives of poor people involves instituting changes in institutional practices so that people will be motivated to think more inclusively or be willing to entertain the idea that it is rational for them as well-meaning, if not self-interested, individuals to promote the well-being of marginal groups. The existing institutional infrastructure currently works against such thinking

1. Renaming doesn’t solve- loss of credibility and failure to create a positive impact

SCHRAM 95

Sanford F. **SCHRAM**, Associate Professor of Political Science at Macalester College, former Visiting Professor at the La Follette Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin and Visiting Affiliate at the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin,**1995** “Discourses of Dependency: The Politics of Euphemism,” Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and The Social Science of Poverty, Published by The University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0816625778, p. 24-25 DM)

Renaming not only loses credibility but also corrupts the terms used. This danger is ever present, given the limits of language. Because all terms are partial and incomplete characterizations, every new term can be invalidated as not capturing all that needs to be said about any topic.22 With time, the odds increase that a new term will lose its potency as it fails to emphasize neglected dimensions of a problem. As newer concerns replace the ones that helped inspire the terminological shift, newer terms will be introduced to address what has been neglected. Where disabled was once an improvement over handicapped, other terms are now deployed to make society inclusive of [end page 24] all people, however differentially situated. The “disabled” are now “physically challenged” or “mentally challenged.” The politics of renaming promotes higher and higher levels of neutralizing language.23 Yet a neutralized language is itself already a partial reading even if it is only implicitly biased in favor of some attributes over others. Neutrality is always relative to the prevailing context. As the context changes, what was once neutral becomes seen as biased. Implicit moves of emphasis and de-emphasis become more visible in a new light. “Physically” and “mentally challenged” already begin to look insufficiently affirmative as efforts intensify to include people with such attributes in all avenues of contemporary life

2AC Poverty Word Kritik

Only way to address issues of poverty and racism is through mass transit

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

TEA-21, which directs more than $200 billion in transportation funding to states and communities and determines how these funds may be used, will expire on September 30, 2003. The reauthorization of the act provides Congress with an enormous opportunity to incorporate provisions that will meaningfully address travel issues and concerns of minority and low-income communities across the nation. The following are some recommendations that follow from the issues raised in the report and from what we know from existing research. Implementation of these recommendations would help address the racial injustices created by transportation policies across the country and advance the national—and constitutional—goal of equality. 1. Increase funding for public transportation, and develop new programs and support existing programs that improve minorities’ mobility. Public transportation is a public service that should be supported. Also, support programs focusing on the needs of low- income and minority transit users to provide reliable connections to job sites and other necessary destinations. For example, the Job Access and Reverse Commute programs support a number of promising efforts to connect low-wage workers to jobs and services, but additional funding is needed to examine which of these efforts are most effective and most likely to be successfully replicated. Also, a handful of significant research identifies increased access to cars as having a positive impact on the ability of minorities to gain access to and retain employment, which suggests that pilot programs that help low-income minorities access cars when public transit is inadequate should be developed.

2AC Gentrification DA

Non Unique: Lack of transportation in the urban area has contributed to the gentrification of the community. Only a risk that providing mass transit is the first step in destroying gentrification

Sanchez at al 03

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S. Ma, homas W. Sanchez is an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities” DM)

Another housing-related impact of transportation policies is gentrification. Gentrification is commonly characterized as a transformation of neighborhood conditions that encompass physical, economic, and demographic dimensions and can be defined as “the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the essential character and flavor of that neighborhood.”122 It occurs for a number of reasons, including increased desirability of an area due to a transportation investment such as extension of a commuter rail line, new or improved train service or station, or addition of a highway ramp or exit. Most commonly, gentrification has been portrayed in terms of residential location patterns, such as “back to the city” flows of middle-income households from the urban fringe or suburbs or elsewhere within a metropolitan area. Gentrification, however, manifests itself through reinvestment and rehabilitation of previously degraded neighborhoods, improving the physical condition and appearance of both residential and commercial properties. Due to the perception that increased property values, increased safety, and improved neighborhood amenities signal neighborhood revival, middle- income households upgrade housing conditions for their personal consumption. While owner- occupied single-family residences replace renter occupancy, businesses that target the demographic group of middle-income homeowners transform older, traditional commercial locations through reinvestment and rehabilitation of structures. Thus, the gentrification process entails physical property improvements, a demographic change to higher income levels, more “yuppie” (young, urban professionals) households, and property value increases. Some neighborhood gentrifications absorb vacant properties, while others involve replacement (or displacement) of households no longer able to afford housing due to housing cost (price/rent) appreciation. While some consider property value increases resulting from gentrification to be positive, such changes have also been criticized for worsening the well-being of low-income persons, especially in neighborhoods of color. Some have argued that increases in property values are capitalized in rent increases, which then push households that are less able to pay to other neighborhoods or to undesirable housing arrangements.123 In particular, some argue that certain antisprawl land use policies that direct housing development away from the urban fringe reduce housing affordability and limit housing choice, especially for low-income households. Others have argued, in addition to causing displacement, that gentrification is undesirable because it leads to homogenous neighborhoods that are not socioeconomically or culturally diverse.124 However, there is insufficient data to draw specific conclusions about the net social and economic impacts of transportation investments on gentrification and displacement.

2AC Spending DA

Funding for mass transit creates more jobs

Smart Growth America 2k11

(Smart Growth America, Making Neighborhoods Great Together, New report reveals smart transportation spending creates jobs, grows the economy, <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/2011/02/04/new-report-reveals-smart-transportation-spending-creates-jobs-grows-the-economy/> February 4th 2011, DM)

In his State of the Union address, President Obama called on Americans to “out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world” to win the future. To rebuild America, he said, we will aim to put “more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges.” A new report from Smart Growth America analyzes states’ investments in infrastructure to determine whether they made the best use of their spending based on job creation numbers. [Recent Lessons from the Stimulus: Transportation Funding and Job Creation](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/lessons-from-the-stimulus.pdf) evaluates how successful states have been in creating jobs with their flexible $26.6 billion of transportation funds from the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). Those results should guide governors and other leaders in revitalizing America’s transportation system, maximizing job creation from transportation dollars and rebuilding the economy. A**ccording to data sent by the states to Congress, the states that created the most jobs were the ones that invested in public transportation projects** and projects that maintained and repaired existing roads and bridges. The states that spent their funds predominantly building new roads and bridges created fewer jobs. As [Newsweek’s David A. Graham explains](http://www.thedailybeast.com/blogs-and-stories/2011-02-03/infrastructures-stimulus-spendthrifts/), investments in transportation have dual economic benefits: Injecting money into transportation projects, the thinking goes, is an especially potent jobs-creation tool because it not only puts construction workers and contractors to work quickly, it also lays the groundwork for future economic growth and development. Obama predicted the transportation money alone would put hundreds of thousands of workers on the job. But as “Recent Lessons from the Stimulus” explains, not all transportation projects reap these benefits equally, and some states created more jobs out of their stimulus funds than others: [S]tates spent more than a third of the money on building new roads—rather than working on public transportation and fixing up existing roads and bridges. The result of the indiscriminate spending? States missed out on potentially thousands of new jobs—and bridges, roads, and overpasses around the country are still crumbling. Meanwhile, the states that did put dollars toward public transportation were richly rewarded: Each dollar used on transit was 75 percent more effective at putting people to work than a dollar used for highway work. Historically, investments in public transportation generate 31% more jobs per dollar than new construction of roads and bridges. **Smart Growth America’s findings show that the payoff was even larger in ARRA spending, with public transportation projects producing 70% more jobs per dollar than road projects**. The same historical statistics show that repair work on roads and bridges generates 16% more jobs per dollar than new bridge and road construction. Repair and maintenance projects spend money faster and create jobs more quickly than building new roads because they employ more kinds of workers, spend less money on land and more on wages, and spend less time on plans and permits. Together, the states spent $15.7 billion (58.9%) of flexible ARRA transportation funds on repairing and maintaining roads and bridges; $8.9 billion (33.5%) on building new ones; $1,042.5 million (4%) on non-motorized projects such as bicycle projects, pedestrian projects and trail projects, and $462.8 million (1.7%) on public transportation projects. **Voters already believe that repair and maintenance and public transportation are where we should focus our transportation dollars, and are a good value for the dollar.** [**A national poll conducted by Smart Growth America and Hart Research**](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/sga-hart-poll.pdf) **in November 2010 found that nearly 91% of voters believe maintaining and repairing our roads and bridges should be the top or a high priority for state spending on transportation programs, and 68% of voters believe that improving and expanding public transportation options should be the top or a high priority**. “Recent Lessons from the Stimulus” ranks all 50 states by how each state invested its ARRA flexible transportation dollars, as reported by the states to Congress. Eight states spent 100% of their ARRA flexible transportation funds to preserve existing roads and bridges and ranked among the top states. Texas, Kentucky, Florida, Kansas, and Arkansas spent the majority of funds building new roads and bridges and comprised the bottom five in terms of average jobs created per dollar spent. Florida and Kansas can point to roads that are in good shape relative to other states and thus less need for repair and maintenance. However, the vast majority of states find themselves in a very different situation, with large unmet maintenance and repair needs that, if allowed to continue, will cost even more to fix later

Jobs key to the economy

Newport 12, Frank Newport, writer for Gallup.com, 07-19-12, “Americans Focus on Jobs as Best Way to Improve U.S. Economy,” <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155768/Americans-Focus-Jobs-Best-Improve-Economy.aspx>

PRINCETON, NJ -- Asked to name the most important thing that could be done to improve the U.S. economy is, more than one in four Americans (28%) suggest creating more or better jobs, along with another 9% who would reduce the outsourcing of jobs. Americans also suggest decreasing taxes (11%), improving the government (8%), or balancing the government's budget (7%) as ways to improve the economy. There is no shortage of opinions on this topic. All but 7% of those interviewed in the July 9-12 Gallup poll were able to come up with a suggestion for improving the economy. While roughly a quarter of the responses were spread out across a variety of topics, each mentioned by no more than 3% of Americans, the employment situation in the U.S. was clearly the most prevalent thought. This is consistent with the finding that unemployment and the economy are the most important problems facing the country. It is not clear exactly how those respondents who said "jobs" would recommend going about creating new or better jobs, but the prevalence of this response category underscores Americans' conviction that jobs are the key to an improved economy. A number of the other response categories involve actions that could be taken by the government, including decreasing taxes, balancing the budget, offering small business incentives, increasing economic stimulus spending, increasing the minimum wage, ending wars, controlling illegal immigration, and improving foreign relations. Another 8% suggested improvements in the way government operates, while another 3% said that electing a new president would be the best way to improve the economy. Notable by their absence were mentions of entrepreneurship or starting new companies as the best way to improve the economy, along with virtually any mention of increasing taxes on the rich or wealthy. There are not highly significant differences in the suggestions offered by Democrats, independents, and Republicans. At least one-quarter of each partisan group suggested that the best way to improve the economy is by creating new or better jobs. Republicans are more likely than Democrats to mention tax cuts and, in particular, to mention balancing the budget.

2AC Social Service Trade Off

Providing Mass Transit is the only way to provide access for other social services.

Criden 2k8

(Madelaine Criden, writier for National Association for State Community Services Programs, The Stranded Poor: Recognizing the Importance of Public Transportation for Low-Income Households, 2008 DM)

Furthermore, transit can reduce social and economic inequalities by enhancing mobility for residents, many of whom lack cars and need assistance in finding jobs outside their primary resident area. Such jobs serve as an important source of income for those that otherwise face limited employment opportunities. Finally, public transportation lowers household expenses by freeing up income for other uses. In 2000, transportation costs accounted for 36 cents out of every dollar spent in the poorest fifth of American households, 98 percent of which was spent on purchasing, operating, and maintaining their cars.5 As urban sprawl increases around the country and transportation choices like walking and biking are reduced, private transportation costs rise and demand for public transportation increases. If reliable transit options were made available to more non- urban areas, it would allow more low-income households to distribute more funds to other essential expenses.

Mass Transit is a perquisite to social services

APTA 2k10

(American Public Transportation Association, “Public Transportation: Moving America Forward: Provides Access for Isolated Residents” 2010 DM)

For the third of Americans in rural areas who do have access to public transportation, public transit systems offer better access to employment, education, health care, social services, shop- ping, entertainment, and friends/relatives. If these transit sys- tems no longer existed, people who use them would have to find alternative transportation or discontinue some activities. RIDES (Rural Initiative Development of Effective Services) Mass Transit District, the transportation provider for 11 southeastern Illinois counties, coordinates transporta- tion needs for clients of 80 agencies to meet job, service, and training needs. In the Robertsdale, AL, region, the Baldwin Rural Area Transit System provides more than 400,000 trips per year.

Their uniqueness is a reason to do the affirmative, if it is true that social service will trade off then the movement in the 1AC is key to solving for this inequality

Bullard at al 02

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at [Texas Southern University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Southern_University), “**Growing Smarter: Building Equity into a Fair Growth Agenda” DM)**

People of color communities are not waiting for government, business, or mainstream environmental groups to come up with a “silver-bullet” solution to address race, equity, and urban sprawl problems that directly and indirectly impact them. Some communities are taking action. Whether central city, suburb, or rural, it will take a coordinated effort among the divergent interests to fix the nation’s transportation problems. It will also take time and resources to arrest sprawl and negative impacts it has on central cities. Clearly, people of color organizations that have long and rich track record on social justice and equity have a ready-made issue in transportation and smart growth. They need only siege the issue. They might bring their considerable collective resources to the table. *Proactive Anti-Racism Strategy.* Race still matters in the United States. Addressing social equity and improving race relations need to be an explicit priority in smart growth initiatives. Racial polarization is impeding community and economic development in almost every metropolitan region that have large concentrations of people of color. Dismantling racial barriers and institutional racism would go a long way in boosting financial incentives and reinvestment in central city neighborhoods. *Building a Equity/Fair Growth Movement.* The equity and smart growth issue has the potential for bringing together diverse community-based organizations, homeowners associations, civic clubs, academic institutions, activists, and government to form broad coalitions and alliances. Working together, neighborhood groups in central cities, suburbs, and surrounding rural areas can band together to arrest sprawl and at the same time begin to address longstanding equity issues that divide people by race, income, class, and spatial location. *Plans to Narrow the Public Education Gap.* Education is an investment in the future. The nation’s public schools remain an integral part of our nation’s future. Disparities exist in financing urban and suburban schools. Innovative approaches need to be taken to equalize inherent funding inequities resulting from an outdated taxing system—namely 7 property taxes. As an example, tax revenue collected from retail sales can be shared regionally, allowing jurisdictions with struggling educational systems to invest in them. This would enable the region to provide a well-trained workforce to attract new economic investments. *Neighborhood Revitalization without Gentrification.* Neighborhood revitalization initiatives that minimize “gentrification” pressures and displacement of incumbent residents should be undertaken. In-fill development should be encouraged in place of uncontrolled sprawl. Public space should be planned in the general welfare of all residents, regardless of race, income, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Other strategies include: provide economic opportunities, including jobs and housing linkage programs; develop and enforce Fair Share Housing; institute Community Land Trusts and land banking that could be used for developments from parks to housing; and design Community Equity Impact Reports to assess the benefits of projects to the community. *Regional Fair Housing Initiatives.* Discrimination is still a major barrier to open housing in most regions. Discrimination costs. A targeted regional fair housing strategy could maximize housing, employment, and educational opportunity options for low-income persons and people of color. Private fair housing efforts should be expanded and coordinated with state fair housing initiatives. Special initiatives are needed to eliminate the “discrimination tax” that is levied on people of color homeowners. Similar efforts are also needed to protect small, disadvantaged, and minority businesses from this illegal tax. *Greenspace Development.* Promote greenspace development that promotes community cohesion, reduces crime, and improves mental health. Trees and greenspace need to be an integral part of all community planning since they increase the shade around buildings and parking lots, and lower air temperatures surrounding vegetation. *Energy Efficient Housing.* Improving energy efficiency in housing is a money saver and could play a major role in improving air quality. Reduction in energy consumption benefits all households. It is especially pertinent for low-income residents since efficiency measures save money, improve human health, reduce air pollution, increase building durability, and enhance property values. *Urban Brownfields Redevelopment.* Current land-use decision-making favors development in the suburbs or “greenfields” rather than inner city areas. Some policies foster abandonment and infrastructure decline. Alternatively, existing policies, such as criteria for funding water/sewer infrastructure could be modified to favor existing, rather than new development. In addition, “brownfields,” or abandoned or underutilized property or buildings, need to be reclaimed and brought back into production. Residents in neighborhoods with brownfields sites must be an integral part of the redevelopment process. *Change Zoning and Promote Transit-Oriented Development.* Change existing zoning codes to encourage multiuse land-development that makes it possible for people to walk, work, shop, and go to school within walking distance of their homes. Planners can shape land uses and development that are amenable to walking, bicycling, and transit use. Transit stations can become more than a place where commuters pass through on their way to somewhere else. Transit-oriented development (TOD) that promotes more dense mixed land uses. *Streets for Walking, Bicycles, and Transit.* Design communities around people rather than around automobiles. As a rule, sprawl development is not pedestrian, bicycle, or transit friendly. Infrastructure enhancements and service improvements are needed to get people out of their homes and cars. Walking and biking are two major travel modes that produce zero pollution. In addition, sidewalks, bike lanes, jogging paths all encourage physical activity, enhance public health, and promote social interaction and a sense of community. *Environmental Justice/Equity Analysis*. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) should demonstrate that their regional transportation plans comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which assure transportation investments promote greater equity in access to opportunities and economic benefits. The assessments will also need to address equity, environmental justice, and adequacy and appropriateness of current data, computer modeling capabilities, processes for assessing needs and developing projects, and use of performance measures. 8 *Improving Access to Jobs.* Sprawl-driven development diverts funds away from central cities. Improving low-income residents’ mobility, particularly for those making the transition from welfare to work, may be the difference between employment and unemployment. Innovative programs are needed to improve transportation efficiency, reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment, reduce the need for infrastructure investment, provide efficient access, examine development patterns and involve the community in such efforts. *Air Quality and Health.* Metropolitan Planning Organizations should incorporate social equity and environmental justice into air quality conformity requirements at all stages of the transportation planning process. It should also encourage the spending of congestion mitigation investments to benefit low-income communities and communities of color, especially if these areas exhibit disproportionately high levels of criteria pollutants. The U.S. DOT should work closely with the federal EPA and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to monitor air quality levels in nonattainment regions. *Public Health and Safety.* Fund research that examines the impact that changes in the built environment can have on public health, such as addition of greenspace, sidewalks, bike paths, lighting, crosswalks, traffic calming, etc. Target research funding to community based organizations (CBOs) and historically black colleges/minority institutions (HBCUs/MIs) to study and design remedies to address pedestrian fatalities and transportation safety issues in people of color communities. Finally, a national strategy is needed to develop and disseminate transportation equity and smart growth messages to the various people of color leaders, organizations, educational institutions, professional associations, fraternal orders, business associations, and other voluntary associations, i.e., church-based, civil rights, education, housing, community development, bankers, health care, legal, etc. People of color take ownership of the transportation equity and smart growth message, they will remain marginalized and on the periphery of the smart growth debate.

2AC Oil DA

Use of mass transit has no correlation with the oil prices. It the opposite, as the oil prices rise the ridership for mass transit rises as well.

Hargreaves 2k12

(Steve Hargreaves, Writer for CNN Money, Mass transit use rises as gas prices soar, <http://money.cnn.com/2012/03/12/news/economy/mass-transit/index.htm> March 12th 2012, DM)

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Ridership on the nation's trains and buses hit one of the highest levels in decades, with officials crediting high gas prices, a stronger economy and new technology that makes riding public transit easier. In 2011, Americans took 10.4 billion trips on mass transit -- which includes buses, trains, street cars and ferries, according to the American Public Transportation Association. That's a 2.3% increase over 2010 and just shy of the number of trips in 2008, when gasoline spiked to a record national average of $4.11 a gallon. "As people get jobs and go back to work, they get on mass transit more," said Michael Melaniphy, president of APTA. "And then when people look at gas prices, they really get on transit more." Melaniphy said [gas prices](http://money.cnn.com/data/commodities/?iid=EL) near $4 a gallon tends to be the tipping point that pushes more people onto mass transit. [Obama makes alternative-fuel vehicle push](http://money.cnn.com/2012/03/07/autos/alternative-fuel-cars/index.htm?iid=EL) While the highest gasoline price spike was in 2008, [gas prices](http://money.cnn.com/news/specials/gasprices/index.html?iid=EL) averaged $3.51 a gallon in 2011 -- the highest annual average ever. Currently, nationwide average gas prices are [just above $3.80](http://money.cnn.com/2012/03/12/news/economy/gas-prices-aaa/index.htm?iid=EL) -- the highest ever for this time of year, according to AAA. Many analysts expect [record gas prices](http://money.cnn.com/2012/02/23/markets/Iran_gas_prices/index.htm?iid=EL) in 2012 as the global economy recovers and tensions remain high in the Middle East. Ridership on public transit, which is measured by number of trips taken, hit its highest level in the mid-1940s -- roughly double today's rate. But with the widespread adoption of the automobile and America's suburbanization in the 1950s, public transit use steadily declined until the early 1970s, when gas prices spiked following the Arab oil embargo. 2011's ridership rate is the second highest since 1957. In addition to gas prices and a rebounding economy, Melaniphy said new technologies have made taking public transportation easier for the general public. A plethora of mobile-phone applications -- there are over 100 for New York City alone -- can display train or bus schedules for your current location. And count-down clocks at train platforms or bus stops take some of the frustration out of waiting for your ride. "Our member agencies are putting a better product out on the street," said Melaniphy. Roughly 5% of the population commutes using public transport, according to the Census Department. Spending on public transport totals roughly $50 billion a year, Melaniphy said. He noted that 75% of those dollars find their way to private companies in the form of construction contracts, fuel purchases and other expenditures. Funding for public transportation is split roughly evenly between federal dollars from the gasoline tax, money from state and local property and sales taxes, and ridership fees