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Gentrification DA

An investment in mass transit will contribute to a greater gentrification as it causes people to move from the suburbs to the cities inevitably rising house prices

Martin 2k10

(Gerg St. Martin, Writer for Coalition on Sustainable Transportation, New Transit May Cause Unintended Gentrification, http://www.costaustin.org/jskaggs/?p=1333 DM)

A Northeastern report warns of the unintended consequences of first-time expansion of transit into some metropolitan neighborhoods. Extending public transportation to a metropolitan neighborhood for the first time can, in some cases, raise rents, bringing in a population of wealthier residents who would rather drive than take public transportation. That’s the conclusion of a report by the Kitty and Michael Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, which found that new public transit investments can sometimes lead to gentrification that prices out renters and low-income households—people considered core public-transportation users—working against the public goal of boosting transit ridership. The study, released today, urged planners and policymakers to consider the unintended consequences of neighborhood gentrification when expanding or improving public tr ansit, given the risk that transit investment can cause undesirable neighborhood change. “Transit planners frequently speak of the need for transit-oriented development to support ridership, but what transit stations need is transit-oriented neighbors who will regularly use the system,” said Stephanie Pollack, the report’s lead author and associate director of the Dukakis Center. “In the neighborhoods (around the country) where new light rail stations were built, almost every aspect of neighborhood change was magnified,” added Barry Bluestone, director of the Dukakis Center and the report’s coauthor. “Rents rose faster; owner-occupied units became more prevalent. Before transit was built, these neighborhoods had been dominated by low-income, renter households.” The report, “Maintaining Diversity In America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It includes new research analyzing socioeconomic changes in 42 neighborhoods in 12 metropolitan areas across the United States first served by rail transit between 1990 and 2000. The report’s findings, researchers said, also raise concerns about equity. Core transit riders are predominantly people of color and/or low-income who disproportionately live in transit-rich neighborhoods. Researchers calculated that transit-served metropolitan regions are currently home to over half of all African Americans, 60 percent of all Hispanics and 70 percent of all immigrants in the United States. The report’s recommendations include advising policymakers to get ahead of the issues using coordinated and community-responsive planning tools, and designing policies that attract core and potential transit users to these now transit-rich neighborhoods. To moderate increases in rents, future housing policies should include funding for land and property acquisition, preservation of existing affordable housing, and creation of new affordable housing, researchers said.

An increase in house prices will cause people living in poverty to greater subjugation and causes racism

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.

Oil

Public transportation investment would substantially decrease US oil demand

APTA 9 (American Public Transportation Association, Spring 2009, “Changing the Way America Moves: Creating a More Robust Economy, a Smaller Carbon Footprint, And Energy Independence,” http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/america\_moves\_09.pdf)

By setting a goal of doubling ridership by 2020, tripling it before 2030, and growing it ten-fold by 2050, equivalent to a 5.5-percent annual growth rate in ridership, a significant, long-term impact on fuel savings and carbon emissions can be made. By 2020, with a 5.5 percent growth rate, public transportation would be saving the United States another 4.5 billion more gallons of fuel per year and an additional 46 million metric tons of carbon per year. By 2050, public transportation would save the United States more than 48.1 billion gallons of fuel per year— more than the amount of gasoline refined from the oil we import from OPEC countries— and cut annual carbon emissions by 449.2 million metric tons, well over one-third the carbon emissions from the gasoline used for transportation purposes today. These investments would have the added benefit of reducing the amount of land consumed for development, allowing greater efficiencies in resource use while giving tens of millions more Americans choices in how they travel. But given how far behind we are in achieving fuel and carbon emission savings from transportation, we must make a much greater effort in the next 40 years if we are to achieve a more energy-efficient, environmentally sustainable transportation sector by shifting the mobility paradigm in America. This means aggressively growing public transport services and ridership on a much greater scale—a 10-percent increase per year. With that level of growth, the energy and environmental dividends would come more quickly. By 2020 public transportation would save the United States 141.9 million metric tons of carbon emissions annually, almost 8 percent of total carbon emissions from transportation today and 15.2 billion gallons of fuel per year, almost as much as we import from the Persian Gulf today. This will have a far quicker impact than bringing more domestic oil into production, currently estimated not to happen before 2018 by the U.S. Energy Information Administration. In fact, by 2033, with a 10 percent annual ridership growth rate, public transportation use could be saving the United States the equivalent of all U.S. off-shore oil reserves estimated in the Atlantic and Pacific combined xviii . By 2040, public transportation use could be saving 97.5 billion gallons of fuel per year, almost the equivalent of what the United States consumes today of crude oil for transportation. Carbon emissions would be cut by 910 million metric tons annually, nearly 50 percent of total carbon emissions from transportation today xix .

Public transportation investment would help the US curb its demand and dependence on oil

APTA 9 (American Public Transportation Association, Spring 2009, “Changing the Way America Moves: Creating a More Robust Economy, a Smaller Carbon Footprint, And Energy Independence,” http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/america\_moves\_09.pdf)

We have squandered opportunities to take bold steps before. In 1973, with the OPEC oil embargo, America had a wake-up call about how fragile its oil dependent economy really is and how reliant the nation is on foreign oil. Many sectors of the economy learned the lesson and became less reliant on oil. Not the transportation sector. The investment in energy intensive highway and aviation systems and the woeful underfunding of public transportation and rail systems continued. As a result, since 1973, Americans are traveling 250 percent more miles per capita each year vii and using over 36 percent more oil for transportation purposes. viii Net oil imports as a share of U.S. oil consumption went from 35.8 percent in 1975 to 58.2 percent in 2007 ix From 1970 to 2007, VMT growth has greatly outpaced population growth, 168percent to 48percent respectively. x . If we had decided to invest significantly more in public transportation services in 1973 and each year since, sustaining a 5.5 percent annual ridership increase from that point onward, we would be saving as much as 4.6 times more fuel with public transportation than we are today (19.1 billion gallons of fuel per year) and 4.8 times more carbon emissions (178 million tons per year). Tens of millions more Americans would be given a true choice in travel and commuting. A new wake-up call Today, as we use vastly more energy resources than we have at any other time in history, we are getting another wake-up call—this time not only about our economic fragility and our limited energy resources, but also about the dire situation of our environment and the survival of our planet as we know it. Transportation is one of the largest and still growing factors of our huge dependence on fossil fuel and with that, foreign oil. Ninety-five percent of all highway transportation is oil-dependent (the rest relying on natural gas, electricity and renewables). Sixtyeight percent of the oil consumed in this country is from transportation (up from 52.3 percent in 1973) and automobiles and light trucks were responsible for over 61 percent of all transportation energy use in 2006. In fact, U.S. transportation petroleum use is equivalent to almost 185 percent of U.S. petroleum production xi . At the same time, fossil fuel will inevitably become a scarcer resource and gas prices will continue to climb. We need to make big changes now to ensure Americans have viable mobility options for the future. 8 The path to energy independence is a long one and addressing oil consumption by the transportation sector is key. With a predicted increase in population of over 30 percent by 2050 xii , travel demand will only continue to increase.

States CP

Federal government can’t solve mass transit

Schweitzer 12 [Lisa Schweitzer, Associate Professor at the USC Sol Price School of Public Policy, 2/16/12, “Doig on the TEA party and a “war on transit” in Salon.com”, Urban Ethics and Theory, http://lisaschweitzer.com/2012/02/16/doig-on-the-tea-party-and-a-war-on-transit-in-salon-com/] aw

 Who lives where in the US is not unrelated to wealth and power, certainly, but I doubt that the issues about how to provide public transit fall into that discussion. Mostly, culture war arguments are lazy. Both sides use culture war arguments to whine and accuse rather than getting off their butts and constructing principled arguments. For example, I have yet to hear one compelling reason why the Federal government is a better funder of sidewalks and bike lanes than states or cities, other than the typical arguments that “those things are good for us!” Of course they are. Why can’t you fund them at the city, or in the case of transit, the state level?

Politics

#### Mass transit does not have a lot of public support --- this makes it easy to attack politically.

**Jones**, 5/4/**2012** (Rob – content and social media manager at Build Direct, Editor-in-chief of the Build Direct blogs, Public Transit and Green Urban Planning: Sexy Buses?, p. http://blog.builddirect.com/greenbuilding/public-transit-and-green-urban-planning-sexy-buses/)

Buses just aren’t sexy. Public transit, public perception The current reputation of public transit as opposed to private car ownership in many cities in North America has an impact on public perception, and therefore it also has an impact on how budgets are structured around the funding of expanded public transit. It has an impact on how the spending of tax money is perceived by the public, with many complaining that they shouldn’t have to fund a service they themselves don’t use. Among other things, this is perhaps a product of not thinking about what their commutes in their cars would be like if no one used public transit. All of this in turn has an impact on the level of political will it takes to think in the long term about how populations should best access urban and suburbans areas, while reducing traffic congestion, creating a more efficient use of land, lowering emissions, and improving air quality. These are long-term investments, that often mean short term budgeting issues. Often, current perceptions about how to manage mass transit simply lead to cuts in services to ‘low ridership areas’ in order to save money. Transit cuts: cutting the throat of future revenue When services are being cut to “save money”, the expectations of those services in general are lowered to the point where gaining ridership back as populations swell over time becomes more and more difficult; no one will spend money on a service that they can’t (or perceive that they can’t) rely on. When a bus runs every hour, it might as well not run at all. You can only cut so much before diminishing returns makes any spending a waste of money. To me, when it comes to public transit, you’ve got to go big or go home. As such, it’s clear that strict standards of service need to be put in place and kept there in all North American cities, and right now. No more of this cutting services because of supposed low ridership. That won’t save money in the long term. It will kill future revenues of a growing number of potential public transit users; remember, populations are projected to double in cities by 2050. By worsening the reputation of public transit in cities for potential commuters, transit cuts actually cut the throat of an expanding market in city infrastructure investment. Cities, states, provinces, nations, need to build on this potential, not kill it. Cultural attitudes affect budgets But, I don’t believe that all of this has to do with money, primarily. I think it has to do with where our cultural heads are at, sitting as we are on the transition from one century and another. I think clever ad campaigns for sexy buses and trains, making transit hubs into culturally and commercially appealing locations, and expanding amenities on commuter trains are all good ideas, and worthy investments to help to design cities around the needs of people who live there. But, I think the main hurdle is still about cultural perceptions on how useful and beneficial taking the bus, the subway, the streetcar can be in modern urban and suburban life in a new century. As it is, I think that taking public transit is still thought of as second-rate to car ownership. The idea of a car-less lifestyle is still looked upon as being unrealistic (in some areas, it is!), to downright bohemian. This bears out when priorities are set for infrastructure budgeting

Spending Link

**Mass Transit is expensive, it costs over $125,000 per passenger!**

Financial God 2k12

(Financial God “Cars Are the Mass-Transit Solution of the Future”, http://www.financialgod.com/cars-are-the-mass-transit-solution-of-the-future/ DM)

**Public agency corruption** Mass transit is becoming more and more expensive, and cities everywhere are decrying a lack of funding. It costs hundreds of millions to billions of dollars to build new lines, and because mass transit corporations are usually taxpayer-funded public organizations, they not only hold a local market monopoly due to government privilege, but they also hold a gun to the local citizen’s head. If they don’t get the exorbitant compensation increases they feel they deserve, they can bring the city to a grinding halt**. The city I live in recently extended a subway line and constructed a few new stations at a total cost of nearly $1 billion, and even the transit agency itself estimates that only around 8,000 people use this new line. Most of those were also existing bus riders. Therefore, the government spent around $125,000 per passenger so that they could sit in a train in a dark tunnel for a few kilometers, instead of a bus**. Talk about a massive waste of resources! That money could have been spent elsewhere for a better return, or, better yet, could have been returned to the taxpayers. Keep in mind that maintenance costs for the tunnel, workers and trains also amount to another tens of millions per year. I wonder how many people pocketed out of that deal. Mass transit is expensive Building elevated rail or subterranean tunnels is very expensive and prone to significant cost overruns and corruption, as the government overpays and construction companies profit from mismanagement of public funds. Elevated rail also has the extra cost of “not in my backyard” protests and compensation. At-grade rail is less expensive, but imposes significant penalties in the form of eminent domain evictions, grade-crossings, and slower transportation speeds. It is one of the worst ways of building a mass-transportation network, except where it is historical and a tourist attraction in places like San Francisco and Toronto. Mass-transportation lines are also rigid. They cannot easily accommodate shifting patterns of demand. A grid network would be more flexible, but costs are usually so prohibitive that these are only built in places where they really make sense, like Manhattan.

Capitalism

**Public Transportation will be implemented to serve capitalist interests and widen inequality**

**Farmer 11**

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf,KB

Public transportation policy is one dimension of spatial restructuring deployed by entrepreneurial governments to create place-based competitive advantages for global capital. Transportation represents a fixed, place-based geographic element where the local and the global interact; where global processes shape local geographies and where local politics shape global networks. As Keil and Young (2008) suggest, transportation should now be considered in relation to globalized trade and economic networks and consumption-oriented patterns of everyday life. Growth demands in cities experiencing gentrification, the development of luxury consumption spaces, and a surge of tourism have placed pressure on local agencies to expand airports, roads, 1156 S Farmerand rail and public transit capacities. Large-scale urban redevelopment plans have made a comeback as city planners conceive of megaprojects that concentrate new public transit investment in the revalorized core (Fainstein, 2008; Keil and Young, 2008; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). Air transportation has become the leading form of global connectivity, influencing the decisions of global, national, and regional elites to create air-transportation infra-structure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting ``premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service. The neoliberal trend towards premium public transportation deployed for the purposes of constructing competitive advantages in the global capitalist system privileges profit making for capital, or exchange-value purposes, and not necessarily for everyday use, or use-value purposes (Keil and Young, 2008; Logan and Molotch, 1987). In order to finance new urban transit projects, cash-strapped entrepreneurial governments are increasingly entering into long-term partnerships with the private sector, or public ^ private partnerships (PPPs), in which the public sector pays for services and infrastructure delivered by the private sector (Phang, 2007; Siemiatycki, 2006; Solino and Vassallo, 2009). In studies of PPPs used both for large-scale urban redevelopment projects and urban rail projects, scholars have noticed that planning agencies are increasingly favoring infrastructure projects favoring affluent segments of the population that have greater potential for profitability rather than delivering the largest public benefit (Fainstein, 2008; Siemiatycki, 2006; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). By privileging market-based metrics of efficiency, entrepreneurial administrations have profoundly changed the function of public transportation. In the Fordist era, public transportation involved a modicum of centralized planning aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs and alleviating the effects of uneven development produced by the highly subsidized highway system (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). Neo-liberal statecraft abandons the Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups' access to the city. In its place, socially regressive neoliberal practices favor market-oriented growth and elite consumption patterns (Boschken, 2002; Grengs, 2004; Young and Keil, 2010). Thus, public transportation service has become a battleground in the global city growth machine's revanchist claims to the city (Smith, 1996).

Only through grassroots action can truly dismantle the current problems surrounding environmental racism. Having bikes is not enough because that is just buying into the false hope of the state being good.

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at 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).

Free Transit CP

The United States federal government should provide fare free mass transit system

Current problem with mass transit and ridership is not the conditions of the bus rather the fare

Olsen No Date

(Dave Olsen, Written extensively on fare- free transit and is a bicycling and walking enthusiast and advocate, “Why Community and Public Transportation Should Be Fare-Free” Community Transportation, DM**)**

As even conservatives like California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger trumpet green agenda, more people are taking a hard look at just how many of their tax dollars subsidize the private car versus less polluting buses and trains. You have to figure in roads, parking and other infrastructure, tax breaks for car and fuel companies, as well as subsidies for car-carrying ferries and federal income tax reductions and write-offs for companies that use motor vehicles. a By some estimates, the government subsidy to each private vehicle owner is about $3,700, while a common cost for providing a single trip by transit is about $5. Yet big or small, most transit systems are scraping by or on the brink of financial collapse, paradoxically because of their reliance on the farebox. Revenue for any system drops when ridership dips or when fares are increased. Yes, when fares are increased. Most often the dip in ridership is caused by a fare hike. To understand this cycle better, let’s imagine that you are in charge of a transit system. You feel pressure to increase service or to maintain service despite increasing costs. You need to raise more money. Politically and practically, for most systems, the easiest way is to raise fares. But soon after, ridership goes down. It drops 3.8 percent for every 10 percent increase in fares, researchers have found. Which means you either haven’t gained much new revenue, or worse, you’ve started spiraling downward.

Free Fare is the only way to increase ridership which causes a shift away from the car culture. It is also the only way to change communities

Olsen No Date (Dave Olsen, Written extensively on fare- free transit and is a bicycling and walking enthusiast and advocate, “Why Community and Public Transportation Should Be Fare-Free” Community Transportation, DM**)**

Recently I met the people who run Island Transit in Whidbey Island, Wash., and rode their fare-free bus system. It’s a serious operation with 56 buses and 101 vans. Ridership tops a million a year. Its operating budget is $8,392,677 – none of it from fares, all from a 0.6 percent sales tax collected in Island County. Despite the pressure to conform, the pressure to make users pay and the pressure from conservative politicians at all levels, Island Transit has been fare-free from day one and is proudly so 20 years later. Not one Island Transit bus, shelter or van has advertising on it. All of Island Transit’s buses are bike rack equipped and wheelchair accessible. For folks with disabilities, Island Transit also offers a paratransit service with door-to-door service. Done right, fare-free transit can transform society, says Patrick Condon, an expert on sustainable urban development who knows the system in Amherst, Mass. “Free transit changed the region for the better. Students, teens and the elderly were able to move much more freely through the region. Some ascribed the resurgence of Northampton, Mass, at least in part, to the availability of free transit. Fares in that region would have provided such a small percentage of capital and operating costs that their loss was made up for by contributions by the major institutions to benefit: the five colleges in the region,” says Condon, a professor at the University of British Columbia. Another success story, a decade old, can be found in Hasselt, Belgium. This city of 70,000 residents, with 300,000 commuters from the surrounding area, has made traveling by bus easy, affordable and efficient. Now, people in Hasselt often speak of “their” bus system and with good reason. The Boulevard Shuttle leaves you waiting for at most five minutes, the Central Shuttle has a 10-minute frequency, and systemwide you never have to wait more than a half an hour. A prime lesson offered by Hasselt is the fact that it radically improved the bus system as well as its walking and cycling infrastructure before it removed the fareboxes. In 1996, there were only three bus routes with about 18,000 service hours/year. Today, there are 11 routes with more than 95,000 service hours/year. The Hasselt City Council’s principal aim in introducing free public transport was to promote the new bus system to such a degree that it would catch on and become the natural option for getting around. And it did – immediately. On the first day, bus ridership increased 783 percent! The first full year of free-fare transit saw an increase of 900 percent over the previous year; by 2001, the increase was up to 1,223 percent, and ridership continues to go up every day.

Case

Mass Transit Does Not Solve- No Transition From Car

Funding does not matter; people will not give up car

Lazarus 2k9

(David Lazarus, Writer for the Los Angeles Times, “US Transit Improvements Will Be a Tough Sell” http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/05/business/fi-lazarus5 DM)

It's hard to appreciate how truly pitiful our public transportation system is until you spend some time with a system that works. Over the course of two weeks in Japan, I rode just about every form of public transit imaginable -- bullet trains, express trains, commuter trains, subways, street cars, monorails and buses. Nearly every ride was smooth, on schedule and affordable. The only glitch came when a major thunderstorm forced one train I was taking through the mountains of Kyushu to be delayed for safety reasons. Anguished railway employees repeatedly apologized for the inconvenience and said there'd be no charge for the remainder of the trip. So I have to wonder: Is it possible we could ever have anything even remotely similar here? "It can happen," said Martin Wachs, director of transportation, space and technology for Rand Corp. in Santa Monica. "But it will only happen over a long period of time and will require a number of policy changes." Specifically, it won't be enough to just lay down lots of track and hope people will leap aboard trains and subways. You also have to discourage the use of cars -- which most Americans won't stand for -- and make our cities considerably less comfortable. Good luck with that. Los Angeles County is attempting to improve its public transportation with tax money from Measure R, which was approved by voters in November. The half-cent sales tax increase is intended to raise as much as $40 billion for a laundry list of projects, including a long-awaited "Subway to the Sea." However, sales tax revenue is way down because of the crappy economy, and it's an open question when work will begin on many of the projects on the Measure R wish list -- and where the money will be found to finish that work once it gets started. California faces similar funding issues now that voters have approved Proposition 1A, which allows the state to borrow nearly $10 billion to get the ball rolling on a high-speed rail line between Southern California and the Bay Area. The planned 800-mile system would, in fact, cost tens of billions of dollars more than that. How much more, nobody knows for sure. Similar projects are planned or have been proposed nationwide. Brian Taylor, director of UCLA's Institute of Transportation Studies, said the hardest part isn't constructing the infrastructure for a world-class public transit system. It's creating the necessary incentives to get Americans out of their cars. "We now keep the cost of driving as cheap as we possibly can," Taylor said. "As long as we do that, we won't be able to make public transportation work." He said investments in transit projects need to be accompanied by policies designed to make driving costlier and thus make public transportation more attractive. These policies include significantly higher charges for parking virtually wherever you go and the increased use of toll roads. New York demonstrates the viability of this notion. Who'd even consider the hassles of driving and parking in Manhattan when you can take the subway instead? Taylor also believes that gas taxes need to go way up, with much of the money used to fund transit resources. Higher prices at the pump could be offset by a modest reduction in sales taxes. The net result, he said, would be more limited use of cars for everyday activities and increased ridership of public transportation, which, in turn, would help generate revenue for additional transit projects. This is a big part of the formula that the Japanese used for their system and also is the one pursued by most European countries. "If we don't put these policies in place here, people will look at our current investment in public transportation 10 years down the line and say what a waste it was," Taylor said. "And then we'll start investing again in road**s**." David Boyce, an adjunct professor of civil and environmental engineering at Northwestern University, said another key piece of the puzzle is land use. Americans prefer low-density communities and large lots for their homes. This may be swell from a quality-of-life perspective, but it's an enormous challenge for public transportation, which requires relatively large numbers of people moving from point A to point B on a daily basis to be profitable. To address this, Boyce said, construction of new rail networks must be accompanied by a commitment to higher-density cities and suburbs in the form of more condos and apartment buildings near transit hubs. It also requires dense clusters of office buildings and retail outlets that represent the jobs and stores people want to reach. The way things currently stand, jobs and homes are spread so far and wide, it's almost impossible to imagine getting around many metropolitan areas without a car. As a result, public transit is perceived by many people as impractical and inconvenient. "It's not a lost cause," Boyce said. "We can turn this around. But we need to address land-use issues if we're going to do it." I hate to be cynical, but I simply can't imagine political leaders at the local, state or federal level telling voters that they support a big increase in gas taxes, sky-high parking fees and high-density neighborhoods. So don't hold your breath for a public transportation system that rivals what our friends abroad enjoy. It's not going to happen -- at least not until a majority of us agree that we're prepared to accept the trade-offs necessary to bring about such a wholesale change in how we live and travel. Until then, we'll always have Paris. And Tokyo.

Mass Transit- No Transition

Rich won’t give up their cars

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.

Environmental Racism will exist

Bullard 97

(Robert Bullard, Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University, “CONFRONTING ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE: IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO” DM)

Numerous studies reveal that low-income persons and people of color have borne greater health and environmental risk burdens than the society at large (Goldman 1994; Goldman and Fitton 1994). Elevated public health risks have been found in some populations even when social class is held constant. For example, race has been found to be independent of class in the distribution of air pollution, contaminated fish consumption, location of municipal landfills and incinerators, abandoned toxic waste dumps, cleanup of superfund sites, and lead poisoning in children (Commission for Racial Justice 1987; Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 1988; West et al. 1992; Bryant and Mohai 1992; Geddicks 1993; Goldman and Fitton 1994; Lavelle and Coyle 1992; Pirkle, Brody, Gunter, Kramer, Paschal, Flegal, and Matte, 1994). Asthma is a classic example of an environmental health problem that disproportionately impacts African American and Latino children and the poor (Schwartz, Gold, Dockey, Weiss, and Spizer 1990). From 1982-1991, the age-adjusted death rate for asthma for persons aged 5-34 was approximately five times higher among African Americans than whites. Between 4 to 5 million children under age 18 suffer from asthma, the most common chronic disease among children. It is the fourth leading cause of disability in children. Poor children are at special risk from air pollution (Thurston et al. 1992). Asthma is 26 percent higher among African American children than among white children. Persons suffering from asthma are particularly sensitive to the effects of carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxides, particulate matter, ozone, and nitrogen oxides. Hospitalization and mortality due to asthma exhibit wide racial differences. The federal Centers for Disease Control found that African Americans are two to three times more likely than whites to be hospitalized for or die from asthma (Centers for Disease Control 1992). In Atlanta, for example, ozone pollution appears to exacerbate childhood asthma problems. The average number of hospital visits for asthma or reactive airway disease was 37 percent higher on the days after the high ozone pollution (White, Etzel, Wilcox, and Lloyd 1994). Childhood lead poisoning is another preventable disease that disproportionately affects poor children and children of color. Figures reported in the July 1994 Journal of the American Medical Association on the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES III) revealed that 1.7 million children (8.9 percent of children aged 1 -- 5) are lead poisoned, defined as blood lead levels equal to or above 10 micrograms/deciliter. The NHANES III data found African American children to be lead poisoned at more than twice the rate of white children at every income level (Pirkle et al. 1994). Over 28.4 percent of all low-income African American children were lead poisoned compared to 9.8 percent of low-income white children. During the time period between 1976 and 1991, decrease in blood lead levels for African American and Mexican American children lagged far behind that of white children. In California, a coalition of environmental, social justice, and civil libertarian groups joined forces to challenge the way the state carried out its lead screening of poor children. The Natural Resources Defense Council, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Legal Aid Society of Alameda County, California won an out-of-court settlement worth $15 million to $20 million for a blood lead-testing program. The lawsuit, Matthews v. Coye, involved the failure of the state of California to conduct federally mandated testing for lead of some 557,000 poor children who receive Medicaid (Lee 1992).This historic agreement triggered similar lawsuits and actions in several other states that failed to live up to the mandates

Only increasing investment is not enough, the public needs to be engaged in influencing policies that affect their 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)

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

Case- Residential Segregation

The problem with racism and poverty is not mobility rather its residential segregation.

Turner at al 2k9

(Margery Austin Turner, Vice President for Research at the Urban Institute, where she leads efforts to frame and conduct a forward-looking agenda of policy research and Karina Fortuny. Researcher at the Urban Institute, “Residential Segregation and Low-Income Working Families”, February 2009, DM)

Segregated housing patterns not only separate white and minority neighborhoods, but also help create and perpetuate the stubborn disparities in employment, education, income, and wealth. More specifically, res- idential segregation distances minority jobseekers (particularly blacks) from areas of employment growthand opportunity. Beginning in the late 1960s, John Kain argued that the concentration of blacks in segre- gated central-city neighborhoods limited their access to employment, as growing numbers of jobs moved to predominantly white suburban locations (Kain 1968). As demand for labor shifted away from the neighborhoods where blacks were concentrated, discrimination in housing and mortgage markets prevented blacks from moving to communities where job growth was occurring, and information and transportation barriers made it difficult to find and retain jobs in these distant locations. William Julius Wilson (1987) expanded on this basic “spatial mismatch” story, arguing that the exodus of jobs from central-city locations, combined with the persistence of residential segregation, contributed to rising unemployment among black men during the 1980s, as well as to worsening poverty and distress in black neighborhoods.2 More recent evidence confirms that residential segregation continues to separate minorities from centers of employment opportunity, and that this separation contributes to unequal employment outcomes (Raphael and Stoll 2002). But the traditional image of minorities trapped in central-city neighborhoods while jobs disperse to more and more distant suburban locations is probably too simplistic. Today, minority workers (and especially low-skilled black workers) are still overrepresented in central cities, while jobs (especially low-skill jobs) are widely dispersed throughout the suburbs. However, in the decades since Kain first articulated the spa- tial mismatch hypothesis, many minorities have gained access to housing in the suburbs. The barriers of segregation and discrimination are falling (slowly perhaps, but perceptibly), and nonblack minorities (whose numbers are growing) appear to face substantially lower levels of segregation than blacks. Nonetheless, the suburban residential communities where minorities live are generally not the suburban jurisdictions that offer the most promising job opportunities. In many metropolitan regions, job growth has been the most robust in predominantly white suburbs and weakest in predominantly black suburbs (Turner 2008). Recent research indicates that nearly half of all low-skill jobs in the white suburbs are inaccessible by public transportation, making it particularly difficult for minority residents of other sub- areas to reach them (Stoll, Holzer, and Ihlanfeldt 2000). And the race or ethnicity of new hires into low- skill jobs generally matches the racial composition of the area where jobs are located (Stoll et al. 2000). Black workers in particular are underrepresented in jobs located in predominantly white suburban com- munities. And although jobs in the central business district may be accessible for workers of all races and ethnicities, these jobs tend to be highly competitive and may require higher skills (Holzer 2001). Thus, residential segregation continues to put considerable distance between minority workers—especially African Americans—and areas of greatest employment opportunity. Residential segregation also contributes to minorities’ unequal educational attainment, which reinforces their disadvantage in today’s labor market.

Case- Education

Residential Segregation causes inequity in the education that kids receive

Turner at al 2k9

(Margery Austin Turner, Vice President for Research at the Urban Institute, where she leads efforts to frame and conduct a forward-looking agenda of policy research and Karina Fortuny. Researcher at the Urban Institute, “Residential Segregation and Low-Income Working Families”, February 2009, DM)

These effects are most obvious—and most severe—in distressed central-city neighborhoods where many low-income minorities are concentrated. Many of these neigh- borhoods are served by failing public schools with high dropout rates, low instructional quality, and poor test scores (O’Regan and Quigley 1996). But the effects of residential segregation on educational achieve- ment are not limited to distressed central-city neighborhoods. Public school performance in minority sub- urban communities typically falls considerably short of the standard expected of schools in the white suburbs (Cashin 2004). A panel study of Texas public school students finds that the achievement of black students declines significantly as the percentage of blacks in their schools rises (Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin 2005). Other things being equal, high levels of segregation in a metropolitan region are closely associated with higher dropout rates among blacks, lower employment among blacks (but higher white employment), and a wider wage gap between blacks and whites (Cutler and Glaeser 1997). And research indicates that public school desegregation plans of the 1970s reduced high school dropout rates among blacks by between 1 and 3 percentage points (half of the total decline achieved during the decade), while having no effect on dropout rates among whites (Guryan 2001). Finally, residential segregation undermines opportunities for blacks to accumulate wealth through home- ownership. Demand for housing in black neighborhoods is largely limited to black households, who have lower incomes and savings on average than whites and therefore fewer resources to invest in housing. Consequently, house values typically lag behind those of white neighborhoods and appreciate more slowly (Oliver and Shapiro 1997). Historically, lenders have been less willing to invest in predominantly black communities or have offered predatory loans that strip wealth from black homeowners rather than help- ing to build wealth (Calem and Wachter 2004).

Case- Spatial Mismatch

You’ve got it wrong, its not that mobility causes racism rather racism is caused by residential segregation

Ihlanfeldt 1994

(Keith Ihlanfeldt, professor of economics and senior research associate in the Policy Research Center, College of Business Administration, Georgia State University, “The Spatial Mismatch Between Jobs and Residential Locations Within Urban Areas” DM)

Six recent reviews of the empirical studies of the SMH have each covered between 25 and 50 studies, which serves to illustrate the extent of the SMH literature. Four of the six reviews conclude with an overall assessment of what the evidence has shown. As noted above, spatial mismatch between the residential locations of black workers and the jobs they are qualified to hold may have one or more of the following effects: longer commutes, lower wages, and greater joblessness. Regarding the first two of these three effects, Holzer’s (1991) reading of the literature leads him to conclude the following: Blacks in central-city areas have less access to employment than have blacks or whites in the suburbs, where access is measured by the ratio of jobs to people within neighborhoods and by average travel times. Employed blacks generally have higher commute times than have employed whites. Unlike most other groups of workers, less-educated blacks face higher wages in the suburbs than in the central city. The magnitudes of these ef- fects are unclear, especially after adjusting for the commuting costs of cen- tral-city residents. But the decline in earnings seems to rise with the degree of job decentralization in the metropolitan area (Holzer, 1991, p. 118). As Holzer emphasizes, the most important issue is the extent to which spatial mismatch explains the lower employment (as opposed to wages or earnings) of black males rela- tive to white males. His assessment of the literature on this point: It seems fair to say, therefore, that the preponderance of evidence from data of the last decade shows that spatial mismatch has a significant effect on black employment. Casual evidence in the last year or two of tight labor markets for young people in various suburban areas, at the same time that central-city employment remains high, also strengthens the impression that spatial mismatch is growing more relevant over time. But considerable uncertainty remains about the magnitudes of these effects, if not about their existence (Holzer, 1991, p. 118). Regarding the effect of spatial mismatch on employment, Kain (1992) states that his assessment of the evidence is not appreciably different from Holzer’s. He also con- cludes that the evidence shows that blacks have worse commutes than do whites. How- ever, on the wage effect, Kain’s assessment of the literature is more guarded than that of Holzer: The impact of housing market discrimination and spatial mismatch on the average gross wages (standardized for human capital characteristics) received by employed Afro-American individuals is less clear-cut on both theoretical and empirical grounds (Kain, 1992, p. 436). However, he does conclude that the few studies that have examined this issue tend to support the existence of a wage effect. My own reading of the literature (Ihlanfeldt, 1992) is consistent with the conclusions reached by Holzer and Kain. It is my belief that if you put aside those studies that have obvious flaws (such as simultaneous-equations and errors-in-variables biases), what is left is a body of evidence that consistently supports all three possible effects predicted by the SMH.

Case- Discrimination

Mass transit is not enough, people will still be unemployed and in poverty because of discrimination based on social location

Ihlanfeldt 1994

(Keith Ihlanfeldt, professor of economics and senior research associate in the Policy Research Center, College of Business Administration, Georgia State University, “The Spatial Mismatch Between Jobs and Residential Locations Within Urban Areas” DM)

The second category of job access improvement policies includes those policies that would improve black workers’ access to suburban jobs without changing either residential or job locations.11 The development of appropriate policies that would fall into this cat- egory depends on the answer to the following fundamental question: Why hasn’t the sur- plus of labor within inner-city neighborhoods been eliminated by blacks, engaging in more extensive job searches and commuting throughout the local labor market? As dis- cussed above, there are three possible barriers that may prevent inner-city blacks from commuting to suburban jobs. First, the distances to jobs in the suburbs may make it too costly to commute to these jobs or may mean that blacks have poor information on subur- ban job opportunities. Second, consumer and/or employer prejudice may cause suburban employers to discriminate against blacks in the hiring process. Third, in comparison to central-city jobs, fewer suburban jobs are within walking distance of a public transit stop, and many inner-city blacks do not own automobiles. **A suburban job will generally involve more commuting time for an inner-city resident than will a central city job. However, it is highly unlikely that this extra time explains the underrepresentation of black workers in suburban jobs**. Consider the following scenario: a firm employing 100 inner-city workers moves from the city to the suburbs and there are no alternative jobs for these workers within the central city. As a result the workers must commute an additional 45 minutes each way to continue to work for the firm. Since the workers would be traveling against traffic, the assumption of 45 minutes of extra travel time may be too high to be realistic. Nevertheless, if workers value their travel time at half the wage rate, as transportation-mode choice studies suggest, the reduction in the in- dividual worker’s net daily wage is less than 10 percent. Empirical evidence on the deci- sion to work indicates that the elasticity of labor force participation rates with respect to wages for the majority of workers (that is, males and female household heads) is probably no greater than 0.1. Hence only 1 out of the 100 workers would not continue to work for the firm in response to its relocation. Including a liberal amount for out-of-pocket travel costs in the scenario might cause enough of a change in the net wage that two workers would decide not to make the suburban commute. Thus, if distances to jobs in the suburbs are important in explaining the failure of blacks to shift their labor supply to the suburbs, it must be that information on available jobs declines with distance. This is an attractive hypothesis, since we know that less-educated workers tend to rely on informal methods of job search, such as consulting with friends and relatives, rather than formal methods, such as contacting a public or private employ- ment agency (Holzer, 1987). Informal methods are unlikely to inform inner-city blacks of suburban job openings. Unfortunately, I am aware of no evidence that relates to this hypothesis. Nevertheless, even without any hard evidence on the role of job information as a cause of black underrepresentation in suburban jobs, policies that would enhance inner-city minorities’ knowledge of suburban job openings can be recommended simply because they may yield a handsome payback at relatively low cost. A second possible reason why inner-city blacks have not adjusted to the decentralization of jobs by commuting to the suburbs is that they may encounter greater labor market discrimination in the suburbs than within the central city, either because of greater con- sumer discrimination or because prejudiced employers deliberately choose suburban loca- tions to escape black workers. If blacks do encounter greater discrimination outside the central city, then stronger enforcement of antidiscrimination laws in the suburbs becomes an appropriate job access improvement policy. There is little evidence as to whether blacks encounter greater labor market discrimination in the suburbs than within the central city, except for the hiring audit study recently com- pleted, for HUD by the Urban Institute (Turner, Fix, and Struyk, 1991). This study con- ducted audits in Washington, D.C., and Chicago during the summer of 1990. The findings indicated that in one of five audits, the white applicant progressed further through the hiring process than his equally qualified black counterpart. However, no difference was found in the degree of hiring discrimination between central-city and suburban employers. These results suggest that suburban employers should not be targeted in antidiscrimina- tion enforcement, but that other strategies should be implemented to improve access to suburban workplaces while pursuing metropolitanwide enforcement of employment discrimination protection. As the authors of the hiring audit study emphasize, a nation- wide employment audit is required before reaching any firm policy conclusions.

Mass Transit- Abelism

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—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, 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 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, 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,” 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 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.

Only increasing investment is not enough, the public needs to be engaged in influencing policies that affect their communities
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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