### Tnotes

### 1AC

**The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in multi-modal transit systems.**

#### The status quo transportation apparatus perpetuates a dichotomous system of residential apartheid between people of color in urban areas and suburban whites

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

In the United States, all communities do not receive the same benefits from transportation advancements and investments.' Despite the heroic efforts and the monumental social and economic gains made over the decades, transportation remains a civil rights issue.' Transportation touches every aspect of where we live, work, play, and go to school, as well as the physical and natural world. Transportation also plays a pivotal role in shaping human interaction, economic mobility, and sustainability.3 Transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring access to education, health care, and other public services.' Transportation equity is consistent with the goals of the larger civil rights movement and the environmental justice movement.5 For millions, transportation is defined as a basic right.6 Transportation is basic to many other quality of life indicators such as health, education, employment, economic development, access to municipal services, residential mobility, and environmental quality.7 The continued residential segregation of people of color away from suburban job centers (where public transit is inadequate or nonexistent) may signal a new urban crisis and a new form of "residential apartheid."'8 Transportation investments, enhancements, and financial resources have provided advantages for some communities, while at the same time, other communities have been disadvantaged by transportation decision making.9 I. OLD WARS, NEW BATTLES In 1896, the United States Supreme Court wrestled with this question of the different treatment accorded blacks and whites. 10 In Plessy v. Ferguson, the Supreme Court examined the constitutionality of Louisiana laws that provided for the segregation of railroad car seating by race." The court upheld the "white section" and "colored section" Jim Crow seating law, contending that segregation did not violate any rights guaranteed by the Constitution. 12 In 1953, nearly four decades after the Plessy decision relegated blacks to the back of the bus, African Americans in Baton Rouge, the capital of Louisiana, staged the nation's first successful bus boycott.13 African Americans accounted for the overwhelming majority of Baton Rouge bus riders and two-thirds of the bus company's revenue. 4 Their economic boycott effectively disrupted the financial stability of the bus company, costing it over $1600 a day.15 The successful Baton Rouge bus boycott occurred two years before the famous 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education declared "separate but equal" unconstitutional. 16 On December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks ignited the modern civil rights movement. 7 Mrs. Parks refused to give up her bus seat to a white man in defiance of local Jim Crow laws.'" Her action sparked new leadership around transportation and civil rights.19 Mrs. Parks summarized her feelings about resisting Jim Crow in an interview with sociologist Aldon Morris in 1981: "My resistance to being mistreated on the buses and anywhere else was just a regular thing with me and not just that day." 20 Transportation was a central theme in the "Freedom Riders"' campaign in the early 1960s.21 John Lewis and the young Freedom Riders exercised their constitutional right of interstate travel at the risk of death.22 Greyhound buses were attacked and some burned in 1961.23 Nevertheless, the Freedom Riders continued their quest for social justice on the nation's roads, highways, and urban streets.24 While some progress has been made since Just Transportation: Dismantling Race and Class Barriers to Mobility in 1997,25 much remains the same. Discrimination still places an extra "tax" on poor people and people of color who need safe, affordable, and accessible public transportation. Many of the barriers that were chronicled in Just Transportation have not disappeared overnight or evaporated with time.26 II. FOLLOW THE DOLLARS Transportation spending programs do not benefit all populations equally.27 Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not. The lion's share of transportation dollars is spent on roads, while urban transit systems are often left in disrepair.28 Nationally, 80% of all surface transportation funds is earmarked for highways and 20% is earmarked for public transportation. 9 Public transit has received roughly $50 billion since the creation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration over thirty years ago,30 while roadway projects have received over $205 billion since 1956.31 On average, states spend just $0.55 per person of their federal transportation funds on pedestrian projects, less than 1% of their total federal transportation dollars.32 Average spending on highways came to $72 per person.33 Generally, states spend less than 20% of federal transportation funding on transit.34 The current federal funding scheme is bias against metropolitan areas. The federal government allocated the bulk of transportation dollars directly to state departments of transportation. 36 Many of the road-building fiefdoms are no friend to urban transit. Just under 6% of all federal highway dollars are sub-allocated directly to the metropolitan regions.37 Moreover, thirty states restrict use of the gasoline tax revenue to fund highway programs only.38 Although local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure, they receive only about 10% of every dollar they generate.39

#### Focus on highways contributes to suburbanization and the relegation of marginalized populations to the periphery of society---inequality is maintained in the name of productivity and automobility, inflicting severe socioeconomic and environmental cost on minority populations

Kuswa, 2k2 (Kevin, Director of Debate at U. of Richmond, “Suburbification, Segregation, and the Consolidation of the Highway Machine”, The Journal of Law in Society, 31.1, Lexis)

How did the Census explain the increase in population that was taking place? Mainly, it augmented the old definition of urban with the notion of the urban fringe. The emergence of an urban fringe marked an [\*42] explicit separation between two types of urbanization: primarily urban and peripherally urban. Primarily urban regions-once utopian places of commerce and leisure free from the hardships of rural existence-took on new characteristics of social malaise, such that the urban fringe became a flight away from the poverty, crime, and inadequate social services of the city. These judgments were not explicit in the Census definition and neither was the source of the momentum propelling the changes. In a way, the addition of an urban fringe that might or might not be considered urban was a reflection of two competing views of the city. n32 Shifts in the classification of urban were not expected to convey preferences for one form of settlement over another. Other historical factors indicate that highways and automobiles were serving as (and creating the need for) escape hatches for wealthy citizens to live outside of the city. It is more than coincidence that the [\*43] urban fringe took on a life of its own at the very same time that highway construction into urban areas was fully funded by federal revenues. n33 The two inclusions of urban fringe-one being the densely settled regions outside the city and the other being the very densely settled regions on the city's edge-took different angles, setting up the transition from fringe to suburbia. The first inclusion required places to be unincorporated, implying that eventual incorporation would open the possibility of suburban autonomy. The second inclusion, bypassing concerns of incorporation, referred to a type of fringe that was densely settled. A dense fringe allowed the Census to distinguish between differing forms of suburban growth. In both instances, the fringe was poised to take on life of its own, weaning itself away from the city as a maturing juvenile leaves an aging parent. The fringe worked to segregate itself, with an emphasis on gate, from fears of the city. The trope of segregation must travel with the suburb, because the fear of segregation "was not spoken by government officials responsible for administering the nation's social programs." n34 National trends and sweeping generalizations of the suburb are difficult to defend. No matter how many theoretical frameworks are applied, "suburbs differ much in the circumstances of their creation, in price, size, durability, institutional complexity, and in the income, [\*44] educational level, and life style of their residents." n35 Despite all these variables, formations crop up that transcend the particulars of a given suburb. A few such formations begin to work through segregation and geographic racism (apartheid) by uniting urban highways with the suburb as a place of white privilege. The suburb was not a consequence of white people feeling as though they needed to leave the city (although that could be a factor); rather, institutional forces supported land and transportation policies that benefited certain groups at the expense of others. B. Highway and Housing Displacements: How Suburbia Contributed To Racial and Economic Inequality An auto journal in the 1920s noted: "illiterate, immigrant, Negro and other families" remained predominantly outside the market for motorcars. n36 The fact that automobiles were available to some American families and not others had severe ramifications on class and race politics. Configurations of automobile ownership and automobile use joined with the newly entrenched terrain of the suburb to legitimize and perpetuate the marginalization of certain groups. It is important that we expand our focus to include the areas affected by the suburb and not just the suburb itself. Many minority and lower income neighborhoods were excluded from the suburbification of America; instead occupying limited land replete with collapsing infrastructure and urban pollution. These conditions, especially the segregation and differentiation of social status based on borders within the city, are not new phenomena. When horses performed many of the transportation roles in the city, pollution was just as extreme in the form of excrement and disease. Usually the large stables were located away from the privileged or well-to-do neighborhoods. On the other hand, it is important to note that the suburb continued these practices and may have intensified them. [\*45] Detailing the suburb as a primary mechanism for the segregation of people, Lewis Mumford targets the metropolis and its co-option by the military and the state. Citing overvalued land, increasing congestion, a lack of space for recreation, a perpetual cycle of growth and decay, and an elitist distribution of social services, Mumford contends: "The metropolitan regime opposes these domestic and civic functions: it subordinates life to organized destruction, and it must therefore regiment, limit, and constrict every exhibition of real life and culture." n37 Mumford's articulation of a regimented urban reality was compounded by the massive expansion of road building following World War II and the 1956 solidification of the highway machine. The rise of the suburb-a place partially produced by (and fueling) the highway's ability to connect the pristine periphery to the central business district-temporarily resolved Mumford's concerns of density and congestion, only to displace those problems with more severe environmental and human costs. Regardless of the organization of the suburb, the construction of highways in urban areas was a traumatic and oppressive event for the people uprooted by the highway's swath. The suburb also exacerbated the human displacement wrought by the highway because the resources necessary to soften the blow of urban construction were being consumed by suburban areas. The suburbs were typically beyond the reach of the poorest residents of the city, a barrier to entry that widened the gap between the rich and the poor, particularly when the poor neighborhoods were often the same neighborhoods torn up by the highway. The paradox was that the highways and the vehicles that traversed them were being promoted under the banners of maximum choice, individual access, and personal mobility. n38 These ideals were used to build more highways, increasing the demand for automobiles, and removing choice from the inhabitants of the city. Personal and individual choice could not exist on a large scale

when part of the process necessitated a destructive dissection of urban areas. [\*46] The connections between highways and suburbia are only less plentiful than the connections between suburbia and segregation. This can be diagramed through the highway machine as a mechanism of containment, population accumulation, sprawl, and what Ronald Greene calls "the racing and placing of populations." n39 According to Greene, a population control apparatus began articulating modes of government to the problems of large American cities. Certain governing logics began to contain these social crises by enforcing the segregation of people based on class and race. While enforcing this stratification, these governing logics were simultaneously lodging blame for the inequality firmly on the shoulders of those communities who had been stripped of access and relegated to the decaying inner city. These moves gestured to a different sense of power than traditionally deployed. Greene sets up this new intersection of bio-power in two places: the emergence of the inner city as a threat to the health of the social body, and the ways a governing apparatus acts to race and place populations. The rise of urban pathologies and the segregation of "unhealthy" groups of people were made easier by the automobile's facilitation of suburban communities commuting to predominantly white- collar jobs. Greene borrows from Mitchell Gordon, a long-time journalist with the Wall Street Journal, to map the emergence of the diseased city. n40 Gordon's work constructs the city as a withering and doomed sign of human destruction, a perspective advocated in the title, Sick Cities. Gordon's immediate concern involves transformations in transportation and automobile expansion, as he explains in his conclusion: "More people in more automobiles, with more time and money to spend keeping them in motion, will speed up the conquest of urban space on earth and, notwithstanding the huge sums that will be poured into new concrete carpeting, compound congestion at critical places." n41 [\*47]

**New transportation policies are necessary to break down the institutional and structural racism that pervades the status quo---only placing a commitment to transportation equality at the center of our decision-making calculus can break-down inequality**

JCPES 11 – The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, an NGO with the goal of improving the socioeconomic status of African Americans and other people of color, expanding their effective participation in the political and public policy arenas, and promoting communications and relationships across racial and ethnic lines, April 13, 2011, “Structural Racism, Privilege, and Policy: A Systems Perspective,” online: <http://www.jointcenter.org/hpi/sites/all/files/DL14%20Concept%20Paper%2004%2001%2011.pdf>

Given the nation’s ongoing economic crises, equity is a critical lens through which we should plan and examine decision-making. In addition, we need to take into account the role of structural racism in the production of inequities. Since the post-World War II period, we have witnessed great gains in wealth among middle-class families – although those gains were not shared by all groups – and they have played a key role in creating health inequities in our society. Current economic circumstances faced by families, communities, organizations, and government create monumental obstacles that could potentially alter the trajectory of racial inequality.

We know that there are structural and systemic policies in place that create inequities by denying whole segments of our population the opportunity to reach their full potential and access to the resources needed to do so. We must address this as a country, but if we allow decisions to be made without examining their equity impacts, we will exacerbate our current situation. During such times, many feel burdens, but unfortunately burdens and benefits are not equitably distributed. We can therefore choose to ignore the equity impacts of our decisions – potentially placing the burden on those that already have too many and allowing racial inequality to widen – or we can face our past and work to equitably distribute both burdens and benefits, consequently changing our trajectory to achieve racial equity.

Design Lab 14 provides an important opportunity for peer networking and collaborative learning across PLACE MATTERS communities. Based on team progress, ongoing PLACE MATTERS work and the current national climate, CommonHealth ACTION and the Joint Center Health Policy Institute have developed plenary sessions and interactive exercises to explore and build strategies that address structural racism, particularly in the realm of policy.

Operational Definitions of Racism

One goal of this concept paper is to ground participants in a common language and the definitions that will support effective discussion of these challenging topics. While there are numerous definitions for each concept, we ask that you keep these definitions in mind when reading the concept paper and throughout your Design Lab conversations—even if they are different than your past learning, understanding, or current perceptions. This is not to say that one belief or understanding is more “correct” than another, but that these are the definitions that will frame this Place Matters dialogue on structural racism and support concepts within the Design Lab framework. In fact, it would be useful for you to think about the differences between the definitions we provide and your own beliefs.

First, it is important to recognize that we are talking about racism, not race. Race is “a social construct that artificially divides people into distinct groups based on characteristics such as physical appearance (particularly color), ancestral heritage, cultural affiliation, cultural history, ethnic classification, and the social, economic, and political needs of a society at a given period of time” (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 1997). Racism is a “ system of privilege based on race” (Wellman, 1977).

Working definitions for Design Lab 14:

Racism (VISIONS):

 Personal Racism: individual attitudes, regarding the inferiority of people of color and the superiority of Whites, that have been learned or internalized either directly (e.g. negative experiences or explicit messages) or indirectly (e.g. imitation and modeling of significant others' reactions, emotional responses to the media; exposure to broad racial disparities). These attitudes may be conscious or unconscious and are learned from exposure to racism at primarily the institutional and cultural levels.

 Interpersonal Racism: actions that perpetuate inequalities on the basis of race. Such behaviors may be intentional or unintentional. Unintentional acts may be racist in their consequence.

 Institutional Racism: established laws, customs, traditions, and practices that systematically result in racial inequalities in a society -- the institutionalization of personal racism.

 Cultural Racism: the individual and institutional expression of the superiority of one race's cultural heritage and values over that of another (Bryant, 2008).

Structural Racism describes the ways in which history, ideology, public policies, institutional practices, and culture interact to maintain a racial hierarchy that allows for the privileges associated with ”whiteness” and the disadvantages associated with color to endure and adapt over time. The structural racism framework takes a step back from institutional racism, and recognizes the racialized cultural and historical context in which institutions and individuals are unavoidably embedded (Lawrence, Sutton, Kubisch, Susi, & Fulbright-Anderson, 2004).

Four domains and systems of Privilege (Alan Johnson):

 Dominance: the default is for power to be held by the dominant group (whites, men, etc.); therefore, most power is held by privileged groups.

 Obsession with control: control over dominant and subordinate groups is necessary to maintain systems of privilege. Dominant groups use the perception of their greater capacity for control to justify their superior position and related privilege.

 Identification: the dominant group is “the standard” and superior; subordinate groups are “the other.” What is associated with the dominant group is positively valued in the culture, including control and power.

 Centeredness: In media coverage, conversation, meetings, etc., members of the dominant group are placed at the center of attention (Johnson, 2006).

Privilege and Structural Racism

Before addressing structural racism, we must discuss what allows it to persist throughout our ideology, our culture, and our public policy decisions: privilege. Privilege allows us to attribute positive outcomes solely to individual actions, and vice-versa with negative actions, without acknowledging the context in which a person grows up and lives their life. By focusing on individual attributes as the reason for success or failure, we are not having an honest conversation about what precedes those individual actions. Opportunities arise throughout an individual’s life, but it is in the unfair distribution of opportunity, and the preparedness to seize the opportunity, that we see the evidence of structural racism.

Structural Racism: A Systems Perspective

Privilege allows structural racism to persist by affecting the way we conceptualize, talk about, and try to combat it. To fully address the issue, we must first change the way we think about the development of structural racism. We can accomplish this by utilizing a systems-thinking perspective. A systems-thinking perspective helps to show the depth and complexity of the connections that link structural racism, privilege, and policy. To elucidate the use of systems-thinking as a frame for structural racism, we will share three examples. These examples demonstrate how to identify structurally racist policies and how seemingly race-neutral policies can promote privilege and create additional unfair and unearned advantages.

A system can be defined as an interdependent group of agents working together as a whole (Menendian & Watt, 2009). Systems-thinking dictates that outcomes are not the result of a linear progression of events or individual behavioral choices. Instead, outcomes are borne out of multiple and multi-faceted relationships. This illuminates that systems are more than just the sum of individual parts. According to the Kirwan Institute, “outcomes are a product of mutual, multiple, and reciprocal interactions within the system” (Menendian & Watt, 2009). Using a structural racism lens, poor health outcomes among African Americans are not simply the sum of structurally racist policies in housing, education, transportation, employment, and finance. The historical and current relationships are so intertwined that we cannot separate out which factors directly cause the most harm. The interactions of culture, ideology, public policy—throughout the expanse of time—have allowed for the promotion of white advantage over the disadvantage of color.

When it comes to cause and effect, we can observe the most proximal relationship as a starting point, but we cannot allow ourselves to stop there. While we search for intentional discrimination as an obvious barrier borne from structural racism, we must also examine privilege.

To illustrate the interconnectedness of structurally racist policies and privilege, the connections among housing, employment, and education policies serve as useful examples. It is important to place policy into historical and cultural contexts. Unfortunately, we do not have the time to discuss the history of white privilege vis-à-vis the disadvantage of color; keep that in mind as we progress through this first example.

Similar to today, the Great Depression created many challenges and opportunities. Many people needed help to secure capital to purchase a home and begin the process of creating generational wealth. However, the benefits of homeownership were not experienced by all segments of the population due to racially discriminatory practices. In a time when everyone needed help to purchase a home, people in certain areas were barred from obtaining loans. These discriminatory practices, adopted from individual property holders influenced commercial mortgage lenders and the Federal government. Property holders promoted segregation in housing through the use of racial covenants. Validated in 1926 by the Supreme Court, racial covenants were put into practice to keep specific blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Jews out of white neighborhoods. Research of King County, WA in 2005 found 416 deeds that still contained racially restricting language (Lind). Many of these covenants confined minority populations to neighborhoods inside of central cities. Here we can see how privilege perpetuated structurally racist policies. Privilege allowed whites to make racial covenants, and allowed lenders to adopt the practice without questioning the validity or implications. This created a policy environment in which loans were not made available in areas with predominantly black or other minority populations.

White privilege allowed discriminatory attitudes to influence policy development. The practice of discriminatory lending was so firmly entrenched in popular and policy culture, any policy that was created to increase homeownership without specifically addressing the barriers of race was virtually useless. The post-World War II time period, 1949-1964, was very important in that it was the first time middle-class families had the opportunity to generate wealth, mostly through homeownership (Shapiro, 2004). With people of color structurally excluded from homeownership and unable to move to new areas due to racial covenants, segregation established deep roots that not even the banning of overtly racist practices could uproot.

Simultaneously, two things were happening that solidified segregation even further. The 1956 Interstate Highway act allowed white people to move farther out from the inner cities, but Federal transit policy did not immediately follow. It was not until 1964 and 1970 that Congress contributed significant money to urban mass transit. But, in a decision that has had far-reaching effects, the money administered by the department of Housing and Urban Development starting in 1974, separated urban transit from the larger Federal transportation strategy (Shoup & Lang, 2011). Employers, noticing that many of their employees were leaving the city, and looking to take advantage of cheaper land and access to highways, moved out of the inner cities (Wilson, 1996). The cumulative effects of these actions were that jobs left the inner cities, but people of color were neither able to move to because of racial covenants nor were they able to travel to employment due to a lack of access to urban transit. These policies created the contexts within which whites were able to accumulate wealth while communities of color were pushed into poverty.

In addition to the aforementioned housing and transportation policies, what happens when a policy is introduced to fund public schools based on property taxes raised from local school districts? Districts receive money from the state, and then are able to exercise local control over additional funds for their schools. However, when this policy is implemented within a structurally racist context, the policy itself may result in harmful racial bias. This is a real world example that can be seen in the Supreme Court case, San Antonio v. Rodriguez. The plaintiffs used two neighborhoods in the San Antonio metro area to demonstrate the disparity in school funding. The Edgewood neighborhood had a population that was 90% Hispanic and 6% African American. It also had the highest property tax rate in the metro area, yet it generated only $356 per student ($26 coming from tax revenue). In contrast, Alamo Heights, a northern inner-ring suburb, whose population was 18% Hispanic and 1% African American, generated $594 per pupil, with $333 coming from tax revenue. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the defendants, citing that the policy itself was not discriminatory in nature (Sutton, 2008).

Sometimes, we do not have to investigate the historical context of a policy to understand its racial implications. One such example is the practice of redlining. It is also an unfortunately useful example to show how disadvantage can accumulate across time. The presence of historically racist lending policies laid the foundation for the relatively recent phenomenon known as “reverse redlining”. Reverse redlining led communities of color to be some of the hardest hit by the economic and housing crises. In 1933, the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) was created to regulate the housing industry and increase homeownership. Areas were rated based on lending risk, with “high-risk” communities outlined in red. Areas that had a high proportion of black residents were labeled as “high-risk.” This practice was not based in any type of official mandate, but was adapted from commercial mortgage lenders that were influential in the policy creation process. This exemplifies that even when institutions do not explicitly discriminate, practices based on discrimination can work their way into policies, creating structural barriers to opportunity. Over time, other bills were passed that should have alleviated the disadvantage faced by blacks, such as the GI Bill, but because they were passed into a structurally racist environment they did not achieve their goal, and in fact helped to reinforce the two worlds of privilege for whites and disadvantage for people of color (Wessler, 2009).

This foundation of structurally racist housing policy led to chronic disinvestment in areas that had a majority black population. It was in this environment that the Financial Modernization Act of 1999 was passed. The Act was a de-regulatory bill that allowed financial institutions to offer products and services within one company (e.g., savings and investments) that prior to that was not allowed. Industry advocates supported this policy because it allowed them to consolidate their services instead of needing to establish different companies to offer specific products and services. This bill virtually eliminated consumer protections by permitting collaborations between banks, securities firms, and insurance companies. These newly consolidated institutions were able to lend money, and were exempt from previous laws constructed to prevent discriminatory and predatory lending. Taking full advantage, banks and other entities began to sell subprime mortgages heavily targeted at communities of color that had been distressed by decades of disinvestment (Wessler, 2009). Here we can see the inequitable distribution of benefits and burdens. Blinded by white privilege, the authors of the Act saw the opportunity to accumulate vast amounts of wealth, at the expense of those already facing substantial burdens.

The Bush-era tax cuts, the dismantling of the estate tax, and the recent continuation of tax cuts for the wealthy, implicitly promote white advantage. Any policy in which the benefits are not equally distributed should raise a red flag for advocates and warrant further examination. When it comes to tax cuts such as these, the people receiving the benefits are overwhelmingly white. As a result, wealth becomes even more concentrated at the top, government revenues are reduced, leaving those who depend on government services, overwhelmingly people of color, struggling to survive.

Your Call to Action on Structural Racism

Through these examples, we can conclude that an important component of the systems perspective is that the disadvantages we see for people of color today are not the result of a singular policy, or the actions of a single individual. In fact, they rarely are. Our policy and legal decisions have made sure that blatantly racist policies and practices are a thing of the past. What we have not done as a society is acknowledge the lasting effects of structurally racist policies that persist due to white privilege.

If we fail to examine the equity impacts of policy, structural racism will persist. The public policy foundation we have built is structurally racist, and if any policy does not take that into consideration, then it will likely be structurally racist. In order to break the cycles that systematically stunt the opportunities in all domains for people of color, and put the country on a trajectory towards racial equity, we must: 1) acknowledge the fact that new policies must address the history of structural racism; and 2) ensure that policy impacts are examined from numerous perspectives and address the relationships that systematically deny opportunity.

While the blame for structural racism does not fall on the shoulders of individuals, the opportunity to change the system and its structure is in our hands. Interpersonal racism still exists, but it is not the primary driver of the systematic denial of opportunity for people of color (Menendian & Watt, 2009). That being said, we will never break the cycle if individuals do not become conscious of their responsibility as individuals to be part of something bigger than themselves. A system that produces such large differentials in advantage and disadvantage will not change on its own; there is no incentive for it to do so. As Paul Johnson says in his book, “people will always take the paths of least resistance,” which in this situation is inaction (Johnson, 2006). For many people, the system works satisfactorily and there is no reason to work to change the system—individuals can afford to continue along our current trajectory. As the Place Matters community, however, we cannot. We must be the actors that initiate and when necessary carry out the change, not just in one sector, but at key points in the system that will facilitate real and lasting equity.

#### Obsession with automobility inflicts significant economic, social, and environmental costs on disadvantaged groups---public transit is a necessary human right

Rose 10 (Spencer Rose, Vancouver-based freelance writer and communications coordinator at a graduate school; has been involved in researching and writing on a wide range of topics for the web, including: historical, urban planning and sustainability issues, “The Social Inequality of Public Transit”, May 3, 2010, http://suite101.com/article/the-social-inequality-of-public-transit-a229957)

Public transit is lauded as an affordable and sustainable alternative to the automobile, yet many who depend on it for basic needs get inadequate service.¶ In communities both urban and rural, travelers who cannot drive, or choose not to drive, rely on public transit daily. Transit use, for them, is necessary to commute to work, to reach hospitals, to cart groceries, to meet friends - in general, to fully engage in countless day-to-day activities of life, making access to transit an indispensable service.¶ In spite of this widely recognized need for mobility, many without private vehicles do not have access to adequate public transportation. Among those hardest hit include youths, the elderly, and especially lower income households. Because it is a basic need that impedes so many aspects of daily life, some advocate public transit should be considered a human right.¶ Transit a Necessary Service for Many¶ In the United States, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) estimates that approximately half of Americans do not have access to reliable transit systems. And in Canada, about 20% of households do not own an automobile, about 10% are low-income, and about 10% have a disability that constrains mobility. A 1999 report by Transportation Research Board of Canada notes that this "lack of personal mobility has an economic, social, and human cost ... [including] higher unemployment, lower tax revenues, higher welfare expenditures, greater medical costs, and limited human development opportunities." Moreover, lower-income households situated in automobile dependent regions also face particular hardship from unaffordable transport. Poor access to good transit, is therefore closely tied to use of the automobile by others - a phenomenon with a decades-long history.¶ The Post-WWII Decline of Public Transit¶ Current problems with adequate access to public transit stem from a legacy of poor urban planning in the mid-twentieth century influenced by the emergence of the automobile culture. Changes to urban demographics and landscape contributed to decades of decline in transit ridership and infrastructure.¶ Before the automobile became affordable for middle class families following the Second World War, public buses and rail dominated transportation in the dense urban communities of North America, often provided by private companies. As city populations and businesses relocated to new suburban developments connected to a recently installed network of freeways and highways, the automobile supplanted demand for public transit.¶ By the mid-1960s, public transit’s market had narrowed considerably, increasing needed public subsidization. As the middle class became car owners, the urban poor steadily became the majority of transit riders. In the United States, this shift in the transit market impacted the quality of public service. “Having limited political influence and contributing a dwindling share of operating revenues, these remaining riders endured declining levels of service. Among more affluent travelers with other transportation options, transit usage fell still further.” Quoted from Barbara McCann's 2000 report Driven to Spend. Surface Transportation Policy Project.¶ In recent decades, things have swung the other way, and a global trend toward deregulating and privatizing aspects of public transportation had taken hold. Strong motivators for this transition were to control public costs, to open the domestic transit markets, and to improve service quality. However, privatization has also introduced higher fares with less frequent service, which continues to discourage riders and push fares even higher, and service even less - creating a downward spiral.¶ Current Transit Use in Urban Zones¶ And although many who possess the means for private transportation opt for public transit today because it is a convenient or “green” alternative to the car, there remains a large number who depend on transit as the only affordable option. And yet, in many municipalities, the high cost of fares has become a financial burden. Automobile use has, in effect, created social exclusion.¶ In a study on why the economically disadvantaged choose to live in urban communities, a major contributing factor identified is access to affordable public transportation. The 2006 report published in the Journal of Urban Economics, entitled “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation”, the authors Edward L. Glaeser, Matthew E. Kahn, Jordan Rappaport concluded that “Within cities, proximity to public transportation does well at predicting the location of the poor.” The high “urbanization of poverty,” they argue, is a result of finding access to public transit.¶ Public Transit as a Human Right¶ Some public transit advocates argue that governments that do not provide a reliable and affordable transit system to all essential destinations constitutes a violation of human rights. In short, public transportation is an essential service, like electricity and drinking water, and therefore something that should be guaranteed for all.¶ Ontario is one Canadian province that has attempted to address the issue of transit as a human right. A report put out in 2002 by the Ontario Human Rights Commission (www.ohrc.on.ca) entitled Human Rights and Public Transit Services in Ontario established “Equal access by persons with disabilities, older Ontarians, and families with young children to adequate, dignified public transit services.”¶ Although improvements have been made in Ontario to deal with disability access (e.g. low-floor or lift-equipped buses), a lack of public funding and low fare revenue continue to undermine the ability to provide equal access to transit for those who are financially burdened. Transit dependent riders continue to face unequal fare structures, restrictive eligibility for discounts, and infrequent service.¶ Transit's Vicious Circle¶ Ontario, however, highlights a vicious circle at work in providing transit service: so long as the public chooses private cars over public buses and trains, transit will continue to be underfunded (from low fares) and overburdened (from diminished service). Consequently, transit authorities are forced to cut transit funding and raise fares, while tax dollars prioritize automobile infrastructure to meet demand. But if transit goes without needed improvements and expansions, the public will never see transit as a preferable alternative to private travel. In the meantime, the urban poor, seniors and young people continue to deal with the existing state of transit service.¶

**Transportation inequality and environmental racism go hand-in hand---improving access to transit is necessary to reduce the disparate impact of environmental problems**

Owens et al. 8 – Research Associate at the Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University (Edward Owens; Gwen Goodwin, Research Associate in the Center for Transportation Training & Research at Texas Southern University; Carol Lewis, Ph.D. in political science from the University of Houston, associate professor in Transportation Studies and Director of the Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University, former manager and director of planning at the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, executive assistant to Mayor Bill White for Transportation Planning; Jeffery Mallory, Research Associate at Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University; May 2008, “An Evaluation of Environmental Justice and Environmental Equity: Laws and Issues that Affect Minority and Low-Income Populations,” http://swutc.tamu.edu/publications/technicalreports/167921-1.pdf)

An Analysis of Environmental Justice Issues and Concerns

At the 1994 conference, Dr. Robert Bullard, Director of Environmental Justice Resources Center at Clark Atlanta University, asserted that environmental justice equals sustainability, and even though the Department of Transportation did not participate in the original work on environmental justice, now is the time for that agency to be more assertive in environmental justice protections. There are many issues that must be addressed, including cumulative risks. There are clear violations of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act in the use of federal transportation funds. The 1964 Civil Rights Act must be enforced. Another enforcement issue arises in the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the social impacts that need to be included in assessments. Dr. Bullard also challenged the definition of "environmentalism." According to Dr. Bullard, “environmentalism" must be redefined to include the total community of where we live and work as well as the natural environment (Panel 2 Discussion, From Rhetoric to Reality; Transportation Environmental Justice and Social Equity Conference, 1994.)

Public Participation

Environmental justice guidelines and practice stress the need for communities to be involved in the planning as well as the evaluation stages of transportation. It is important that agencies coordinate with a cross section of community organizations that represent the public and that bring critical issues to the table. Public participation is needed for all citizens in decision making and in the planning process for the development of more equitable solutions to facility location matters, especially the transportation needs of minorities and low-income people that often overlooked. One of the intense challenges for government agencies is to not only provide citizens the opportunity to comment, but incorporate those comments into design stages; citizens must be involved throughout the entire planning, evaluation and implementation process.

Access to Public Transportation

Many citizens are locked out of opportunities for education, employment, healthcare, social and other essential or governmental services because they have no transportation and are not included in the processes through which transportation policies and plans are made. This is one example of an environment justice infraction. Similar to the private sector markets, policy officials tend to focus on the lowest immediate costs associated with sites, using conventional marketplace criteria in making their decisions for federal, state, county and municipal public service offices. Criteria include the price of land, construction costs and build-out expenses. Such costs are also the criterion applied to decisions about a wide range of public facilities, including county hospitals, post offices, public welfare offices, transit services and accommodations for senior citizens, and public housing complexes. The rationale is that the government must get the best deals for the tax payer money. A transportation system that can provide people with efficient and affordable access to these locations is a factor that is often overlooked in the long-term success of a facility. If the people who need the services most are unable to easily use them, even the best facilities are useless.

A community's ability to provide services such as educational and cultural programs and to aid in economic development, an asset upon which communities can build and develop, is largely dependent upon the positive role of transportation to that community. It can allow communities an option to suburban sprawl, which contributes to deterioration in inner cities, often negatively affects the environment and creates public health problems.

However, there is an inequity in the expenditure of public funds on urban/rural poor and communities of color in comparison with those spent on wealthy/suburban communities. Many communities believe that government has a responsibility to correct its historical lack of investment in inner city communities.

Locating Public Facilities

Sometimes, government programs and policies do not work in tandem which is a concern. Even in agencies with a mandate to promote access, the agency's real estate office, working in isolation, may locate inaccessible facilities. In contrast, transportation programs working closely with housing, health, education, and other community service systems, can dramatically enhance equity and environmental quality. However, the essential connection between transportation and the location of governmental services is part of a broader issue. Transportation planning usually focuses on mobility issues, but location and access can play a much more important role by making sure that government offices are near the people who need to use them.

Access to Health Care

Health care facilities already exist to serve the poor and the uninsured, but many people are not able to benefit from these health services due to the lack of transportation. Facilities are often located in areas not served by public transportation and those without automobiles have to rely on expensive alternatives such as taxis, ambulances, or even a car rental. Some Americans choose to use their money needed for food and shelter either to get to the clinic for routine check-ups or to go without preventive health care. Sometimes, emergency care becomes the only kind of care that they receive. Transportation’s impact on health care is likely greater than generally considered.

The Tahana Whitecrow Advocacy Alliance organization in Oregon described how public transportation issues are critical to the Native American community. For the urban Native American community, transportation has sometimes been a barrier and sometimes a lifeline to services, particularly health care. This Oregon community worked together regarding transit access to a local health clinic. The public transit line serving that population stopped roughly one mile from the only Native American medical clinic. Transit-dependent patients, including patients who were sick, pregnant, disabled, elderly or simply in need of routine check-ups were forced to walk a mile on what amounted to be a muddy trail because there were no sidewalks.

The Tahana Whitecrow Advocacy Alliance asked the transit agency on behalf of the community to extend the transit line an additional mile. The General Manager denied their request. It took protests, legal challenges, and a new General Manager before the community won the mile-long extension (Panel 2 Discussion, From Rhetoric to Reality; Transportation Environmental Justice and Social Equity Conference, 1994).

Contra Costa's citizens in San Francisco were more successful in their efforts. They engaged the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund to file a class-action lawsuit to prevent the County from building a new hospital in an area inaccessible to poor and minority residents. Although the hospital was already under construction, the federal district court halted the project, citing that construction of the new county hospital in Central County, without any improvement in public transportation or the availability of health care services to the Western and Eastern Counties near poor minorities, will, in effect, entrench and perpetuate the county's alleged systemic discrimination against the county's indigent minorities (U.S. District Judge Saundra Brown Armstrong, August 1994). Judge Armstrong also made it clear that looking at statistics on travel time for all county residents was not relevant; only data that zeroed in on the people who actually used the hospital were to be considered.

Transit Linkage

Transportation's interrelationship with service delivery needs to be viewed from three perspectives: 1) public participation in decision-making, 2) citizens access to facilities, and 3) community economic development. Sometimes, fragmented governmental authority is responsible for instances of social inequity. Usually, a capital planning, real estate, or procurement office does the work of finding locations, negotiating leases, and purchasing properties. Often the operating agency which will occupy the facility is not involved in the siting process, even though it will be accountable, ultimately, for providing services and is in the best position to understand the potential impacts that siting decisions can have on their clientele.

Clearly, operating agencies should be more closely involved in the location of their facilities so they can be held accountable for their success in providing services, but often, in those rare instances when the best possible site for a facility is in an area not served by public transportation, the government agency is responsible for working with transit officials to provide efficient public transit access to the site-using the provisions of the TEA-21 transit legislation. Further, the need to expand limited public transit service is extremely acute in rural areas, as well as in inter-village/town transportation where no public transit access exists and thus maintains a serious, chronic barrier to accessible government services.

Transit-Oriented Development

Transit-oriented development (TOD) involves promoting densification, mixed land uses, and design for human scale. Critics have charged that many of these concepts lead to gentrification— many "neo-traditional" neighborhoods are too expensive for low-income individuals. Communities have been relatively unsuccessful in identifying long term solutions that maintain a level of affordability in TOD neighborhoods. The California legislature is currently considering a bill that would allow for "mixed-income" zoning, requiring new developments to contain at least 15 percent affordable housing (Senate Bill 46, As Amended: July 5, 2997).

The project or area served by the grant must include 15 percent of units that will be affordable to renters earning no more than 60 percent of the area median income or homeowners earning not more than 120 percent of area median income. It also requires rental units remain affordable for 55 years and ownership units be sold to qualified households and subject to resale restrictions for at least 30 years (http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/07- 08/bill/sen/sb\_0001-0050/sb\_46\_cfa\_20070709\_132639\_asm\_comm.html ).

Transportation advocates view TOD as a proven strategy to reduce commuting pressures and the inducement of traffic flow and continued sprawl. It is believed that zoning changes can also vary property use within city blocks, giving people easy access to more services.

Public Transportation

Even the most successful low-income community economic development program will not be successful without transportation services that are affordable, efficient, convenient, and that cover sufficient territory. For many economically disadvantaged individuals, mass transit may be the only form of transportation accessible. Low-income people constitute the largest share of total public transit ridership.

Although U.S. public transit services in some locales deteriorated between the 1980s and 1990s, there is renewed interest in public transit as a means of alleviating congestion and air pollution, and of improving access and mobility. The passage of ISTEA, TEA21 and SAFETEA-LU granted municipalities the latitude to shift highway funds to transit projects and promoted coordination of transportation and land use. These bills provided a clear signal that communities are beginning to recognize the strains resulting from extreme auto dependency.

Federal Response to Environmental Justice Issues and Concerns

Following the Clinton Administration’s issuance of its Executive Order on Environmental Justice in 1994, activists called for an advisory council initiating a process of inclusion with the EPA and established the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (http://www.epa.gov/compliance/environmentaljustice/nejac/index.html). ISTEA, TEA-21, and SAFETEA-LU not only contain strong public participation rules, but offer a variety of funding sources to facilitate community development and adequate local transportation including the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds (CMAQ), statewide transportation enhancement funds, and flexible funding for Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects which include roads, transit, bicycling, and walking. Low-income communities can take advantage of these funding opportunities as they offer greater emphasis on transit, bicycling, walking, and travel modes dominant in low income neighborhoods.

Transportation officials must ensure that their transportation plans comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, a requirement made by ISTEA, TEA 21, and SAFETEA-LU. Although some see this as a barrier, Title VI requires that any transportation investments or policies involving federal funds, such as the siting of highway corridors or the implementation of congestion pricing do not disproportionately harm communities of color.

Rural areas, with less than a fourth of the nation's total population but nearly forty percent of the nation's poor only receive about 7 percent of transportation funds. The limited potential for funding in rural areas is also compromised by the difficulty rural communities encounter in meeting the 50 percent operating expenses (collected mainly through fares) matching fund requirement that is often stipulated at the state level (Surface Transportation Policy Project, 1995).

Access

Questions on measures of system accessibility include: 1) Coverage and extent. Is a transit line or arterial near the minority neighborhood under consideration? Are minority groups in the region likely to depend on transit for their local travel? Do transportation options link housing with services and employment sites? 2) Service level. How often does the bus come by? How crowded is it? Urban minority neighborhoods are sometimes characterized by packed buses, and pass-ups. Some systems provide higher quality service for suburban park and ride patrons, buses with luggage racks, reading lights and higher quality seating. Unpaved roads or no transit service at all is usually par in rural areas.

Assessing Transit Investment

A civil rights or environmental justice analysis could: examine investment patterns proposed in the long-range plan or transportation improvement program; seek to pinpoint the percentage of road and transit funding going to areas with high proportions of minority residents, and how this investment pattern compares to the population pattern in the region or state; ask whether adequate funding is being devoted to maintain older areas with high minority populations or is the bulk of funding being devoted to new projects in newly developing areas; determine if lowincome and minority communities are receiving older, less reliable transportation equipment and vehicles than wealthier communities.

When discussing questions of fairness, the disproportionate subsidization of transportation services for wealthier communities can be examined. The Labor Community Strategies Center in Los Angeles pointed out that overcrowded bus routes in its center city actually break even or make money while the new commuter rail lines to outlying suburbs require tax subsidies of $10- $20 per rider.

#### Environmental justice is a fundamental issue---only explicitly acknowledging the disparate impact of environmental harms can avoid perpetuating the racist legacy of colonialism and mass violence

**Rasmussen 10** [Larry Rasmussen, Th.D., Reinhold Niebuhr Professor Emeritus of Social Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, “Environmental Racism and Environmental Justice: Moral Theory in the Making?”, <http://www.ecojusticenow.org/resources/Eco-Justice-Ethics/Environmental-Racism-and-Environmental-Justice.pdf>, 9/12/2010] SV

For the EJ movement, experiences of environmental racism and injustice are not random, nor are they individual. Environmental injustice happens to groups and its causes are systemic. And while EJ advocates are diverse—far more than the membership of other environmentalist organizations—they are of a common mind that understanding the collective experience of injustice means “uncovering the way society reproduces unshared power arrangements.” 7 Routine privilege, or lack of the same, is not a product of the dice throw of good or back luck. Privilege and its absence are not acts of God, good or bad karma, or individual merit earned or lost on a putative level playing field. Yes, the evolutionary happenstances of nature and the idiosyncrasies of history down the long corridors of time do decide socio-environmental conditions in grave measure. (Jared Diamond’s Guns, Germs, and Steel and Rick Potts’ Humanity’s Descent: The Consequences of Ecological Instability argue this in different but compelling ways. 8 ) Yet even signature socio-evolutionary developments finally play out “in the ‘hood,’” the work of power relations in society-nature, not fate. The EJ conclusion is that unshared power and lack of access to self-determining power is at the root of collective socioenvironmental injustice. (This means, for a theory of justice, that justice as recognition and participation move alongside justice as distribution and may be as critical. More on that anon.) History carries harsh reasons for this conclusion about (lack of) power and access. Near-term reasons rest in Civil Rights issues and, behind those, a drama that stretches back to the Civil War. Few other environmentalists link to Civil Rights and post-Civil War struggles but EJ activists often do, for their networks, strategies, and inspiration. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s last act as one of solidarity with Memphis garbage workers is remembered as a bridge from Civil Rights struggles to environmental justice ones. The term “environmental racism” itself emerged in a similar context. It was the charge shouted by a young woman at a 1982 protest in Warren County, North Carolina, against another PCB landfill in that predominately African-American county. “This here ain’t nothin’ but environmental racism,” she said. With that, the experience of generations rose to the surface, and the term stuck. Deeper history runs back even farther, to the underlying first works of the modern era itself. Those works rest in what some now refer to as “the first wave of globalization.” 9 They center in the impact of Europe-based ways on the local well-being of peoples and their environments around the world within the framework of conquest, colonization, commerce and Christian implantation. This complex, which sailed from Europe starting in the 15 th century or so, established advantages that continue into the present. The point for the EJ movement is that these four interlocking “C’s” exploited peoples of color together with their lands across the very epoch they created. To be sure, the legacy of slavery and the plunder of Native Peoples and their lands, together with the colonization of Latin and Caribbean peoples and lands, is not a matter of daily rhetoric in every EJ campaign. More proximate issues and causes capture the attention on most days. But in sharp contrast to the consciousness and narrative of white environmentalists, these burning memories live on. As part of knowing “whence [one] came” (Baldwin), they continue to fire the movement’s commitment to environmental justice. This collective injustice, bolstered by memories firmly set in the bones, creates a markedly different moral world for the EJ movement compared with those of other environmentalist organizations and movements. Preservationist and conservationist organizations, for example, frequently make their case on the basis of an assumed common good. To their credit, more-than-human membership belongs to the moral universe of this assumed good. The goal is to bequeath as many elements of present nature as possible—forests, grasslands, rivers, wetlands and oceans, species—to future generations. Yet justice and a race/class/gender/culture analysis, together with a concentration on urban conditions and those of the urban, rural and reservation poor, hasn’t been part of this “common” good as normal fare. Commonly these have not appeared at all. Or, in the face of recent and stinging criticism, they appear a public relations afterthought rather than a substantive redirection. Nor has the core question of the EJ movement been the chief question of preservationists and conservationists. Namely, “What constitute healthy, livable, sustainable, and vital communities in the places we live, work, and play, as the outcome of interrelated natural, built, social, and cultural/spiritual environments?”

#### Improving public transit is an issue of social justice---it affects health, crime rates, safety, sexism, racism, and multiple other forms of suffering and exploitation

BRU 3 (Bus Riders Union, organization that works to increase funding for inner city bus service, “BILLIONS FOR BUSES”, February 11, 2003, bru.vcn.bc.ca/uploads/images/26/position\_paper.pdf)

 Access to transportation has important implications for social justice in our region. For transit dependent¶ people, access to transit shapes and limits our ability to access school, work, health care, recreation,¶ volunteer commitments, daycare, the political process, information, peers, nature, and the arts.¶ From our experience of organizing on Vancouver’s buses, we at the Bus Riders Union know that¶ transit dependent people are low-wage workers, the unemployed, refugees, students, children, seniors,¶ people with disabilities, First Nations people, and immigrants. They are majority people of¶ colour and majority women. They are the economically exploited and politically marginalized in this¶ society. Policies that negatively impact transit dependent people are implicitly racist and sexist policies.¶ Social justice for the transit dependent is not just a vague slogan for us at the Bus Riders Union. It is¶ a principle that requires specific policy measures.¶ Social Justice means lower fares for the overwhelming majority of bus riders who ride the bus out of¶ economic necessity. For the mom on welfare who has to take $103 out of her $370 a month budget¶ to get around the city (that’s almost a third of her disposable income to buy a bus pass for herself and¶ her child); and for the new immigrant making the $6/hour training wage who works a full hour just to¶ cover the bus fare to and from work.¶ Social justice means late night bus service for transit dependent shift workers, overwhelmingly new¶ immigrants and refugees. And for people like the Kwantlen college student who recently told a BRU¶ organizer that he doesn’t get to go out with his friends much because the last bus home is at 10¶ o’clock.¶ Social justice means expanding accessibility so that people with disabilities have equal access to all¶ parts of the city without having to book handy-dart 4 days in advance.¶ Social justice is about more buses so that bus riders don’t have to face the everyday frustration of¶ long waits and overcrowding.¶ Principles¶ BRU Billions for Buses¶ Public Health¶ Everyone who lives in Greater Vancouver knows what a critical question air quality is for the region.¶ Everyone in this region enjoys the air quality benefits that accrue from a public transit system. However,¶ the positive public health impact of improved transit (or the negative impact of cuts) includes¶ more than just air quality. For transit dependent people, in particular seniors and people with disabilities,¶ the mobility that comes with an accessible, reliable transit system is critical to maintaining good¶ health. And for women, children, gays and lesbians, targets of domestic violence, sexual assault and¶ hate crimes, a reliable ride home is absolutely critical to their personal safety.¶ From this broad public health perspective clearly an expanded fleet of clean air and trolley buses is the¶ highest priority for the region. Buses meet the critical transportation needs of the transit dependent.¶ In terms of air quality, buses have a crowding out effect on cars, as opposed to grade separated transit¶ like Skytrain which actually creates room for more cars on the road. A well run bus system is dynamic¶ and flexible to the changing transportation patterns of a growing region.¶ While “shaping growth” through transportation policy may be an important long-term strategy for the¶ region, it becomes an empty slogan when TransLink responds to financial crisis brought on by Millennium¶ Skytrain costs by making poor decisions such as implementing the use of lower grade diesel fuel¶ in buses.¶ If policy makers are serious about improving the public health of this region they would do well to¶ listen to rider priorities: expanded service, lower fares, more rapid bus routes, increased accessibility,¶ clean air buses, quieter buses, new routes, and night owls.

#### A lack of infrastructural investment in public transit disproportionately impacts minority-groups---new investment is necessary to reduce suburban sprawl

**Raya & Rubin 6** “Safety, Growth, and Equity: Transportation” Richard Raya and Victor Rubin, policylink transportation series, http://www.policylink.org/atf/cf/%7B97C6D565-BB43-406D-A6D5-ECA3BBF35AF0%7D/SGE-Transportation.pdf

Likewise, transportation projects can also have serious and negative impacts on communities. For example, the practice of siting urban highways through existing low-income and minority communities has displaced thousands of families in cities across the nation, reduced the supply of affordable housing, physically divided thriving communities, and served as a precursor to disinvestment and urban blight in these areas. Additionally, automobile emissions, noise, and trafﬁ c danger from highways and major thoroughfares impact the health of families living nearby. **Investments in transportation infrastructure have been a driving force behind regional growth trends and the rise of “suburban sprawl,” a dispersed, low-density pattern of single-use development that makes driving the only convenient mode of travel**. In a recent survey, the nation’s leading urban scholars ranked the federal subsidy of the interstate highway system as the number-one inﬂ uence on the American metropolis over the past 50 years. 4 The 41,000-mile interstate highway system transformed American cities by facilitating suburbanization and sprawl development and triggering white ﬂ ight from central cities. By paving new roadways to cheap land outside the central city, highway builders made it possible for developers to put new housing and development in outlying areas which were previously inaccessible. The car is king in California. The state’s residents make the vast majority of their trips by car (86 percent), and 84 percent of trips to work are made by individuals driving alone. Public transit accounts for 2.2 percent of trips annually, 8.4 percent are made on foot, and about 1 percent is made by bicycle. 5 These numbers illustrate the modern reality in California: that driving is often the fastest, most convenient way to get around. Each household is also driving more miles every year, and the increase in miles driven consistently outpaces population growth. 6 Although driving is the mode of choice, children and youth, the elderly, and the disabled are often dependent on alternative modes of transportation for independent mobility, and these segments of society are steadily growing. Children 17 years and under—a fast-growing segment of the population—made up 27 percent of California’s population in 2000. 7 The elderly are a growing percentage of the population as well. While California’s overall population is expected to increase nearly 33 percent by 2020, the senior age group is projected to increase about 71 percent. 8 Those who cannot afford cars or who are unable to drive independently face substantial barriers to mobility today. In 2000–2001, 9.3 percent of California households did not have a car. 9 Additionally, over 90 percent of former welfare recipients have no access to a car. 10 Without a car, many job opportunities are out of reach for welfare recipients and low-income families. Researchers studying the most recent national travel data conclude, “Clearly, many low-income households are cut off from some destinations they need to reach because they cannot afford the automotive transportation needed to access most parts of metropolitan areas.” 11 A study conducted by the Transportation and Land Use Coalition of the Bay Area (TALC) found that **poor transit service is a barrier to health for many families**. In Contra Costa County, only 20 percent of residents in low-income neighborhoods have transit access to a hospital; 33 percent have transit access to a community clinic, and only 39 percent have a supermarket within walking distance of their homes. 12 An equitable transportation system will be ﬂ exible and responsive to the needs of different communities and groups.3 PolicyLink Low-income and minority groups use transit, bike, and walk more often than whites and higher-income groups. Generally, transit ridership declines as income increases, and this drop is particularly stark for bus transit. Low-income households are eight times as likely as wealthy households to take a trip by bus (4 percent vs. 0.5 percent). 13 In Los Angeles, 48 percent of riders on the county MTA’s (Metropolitan Transit Authority) buses have household incomes of less than $15,000. 14 The most recent national survey shows that **African Americans are almost six times more likely than whites to take transit** (5.3 percent vs. 0.3 percent), **and Latinos are about three times more likely** to ride transit than whites (2.4 percent vs. 0.3 percent). 15 Our nation has a legacy of transportation policies and investments that inadequately serve and often isolate low-income and minority communities from jobs, services, education, and housing opportunities essential to escape poverty and fully participate in society. In fact, the civil rights movement began with efforts to ﬁ ght racism in the transportation system. 16 Shortly after Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others organized the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott; and later the “Freedom Riders” risked their lives traveling across the country to exercise their right to ride on desegregated buses.

#### Transportation investments are necessary to reduce socio-economic inequality---the poor are structurally locked out of better living conditions in the status quo

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

2.27 Transport has direct impacts on the personal welfare of all income groups. It is generally accepted that access to at least minimal infrastructure services is one of the essential components of personal welfare. Improvements in transport not only provide people with more convenient access to a broad range of socio-economic opportunities, but also have strong income effects by lowering transport cost and hence the prices of consumer goods and services. In these ways, transport exerts a pervasive contribution to the improvement in personal welfare. Understanding the transmission of these impacts is especially important in assessing transport’s direct contribution to poverty reduction. 2.28 Transport’s impact on personal welfare may be best assessed by examining closely how transport affects people’s daily activities. People make trips to workplace, to school and to the locations of social services. Since income is the dominant determinant of individual travel behavior, more trips per person, longer average trip distance, and faster and more comfortable modes of transport are all associated with rising incomes. As incomes grow, people are able to afford access to more employment opportunities and more social interactions. Given normal preferences for these activities, demand for travel increases. 2.29 For the poor, the lack of affordable access deprives them of the ability to take advantage of job opportunities and even of very basic social services. Reliable access to schools and health services for the poor contributes directly to their accumulation of human capital, which is a key factor in sustainable poverty alleviation. In as much as jobs and basic social services are relatively highly valued by the poor, it can be said that the associated basic transport access is of high value to the poor. In this sense, improvements in transport conditions can have greater welfare implications for the poor than for the rich. 2.30 Transport conditions for the poor in many developing countries are far from adequate. For example, the rural poor often have extremely limited mobility beyond their immediate settlement due to geographical isolation and the high cost of motorized transport. As a result the poor are not able to take advantage of employment opportunities, such as seasonal work, beyond their settlements. Adequate access to the outside world provides mobility for these opportunities. Moreover, an adequate transport network reduces regional variations in food prices and the risks of famine by facilitating the movement of food from surplus to deficit areas. For farmers in general, improved rural transport can also ease the introduction of improved farming practices and the transition from subsistence farming to cash crops and a market economy. Transport improvements also lower the costs of inputs such as fertilizer. Reliable access (all weather passability) to input and output markets can stimulate higher cash-crop farming production and more stable incomes, and enable the poor to improve their management of risks. Rural transport improvement can benefit urban populations as well. For example, by lowering the cost of rural (and rural to urban) transport, a reduction in food prices for the urban poor can be achieved.20 2.31 Access to job opportunities in urban areas, including by non-motorized transport, is necessary for the poor to participate in most income-earning activities. In many developing countries, the urban poor are concentrated on the periphery of urban areas which is far from their workplaces. Many poor workers take several part-time, low-paid jobs at different locations, simply to maintain the very basic level of household income. Many school children have to help their poor parents after school hours to raise household income. Their ability to obtain employment and education is highly dependent on the costs and availability of public transport. Because residential relocation is often very difficult for the poor due to high moving costs and lack of affordable alternative locations, providing affordable public transport can have an immediate impact on the personal welfare of the urban poor. Summary 2.32 An overall strategy for poverty reduction should be formulated in terms of a twopronged approach: broadly based economic growth to generate income-earning opportunities for the poor and targeted interventions to meet the basic needs of the poor. In general, these define both the indirect and direct approaches to poverty reduction. Within this framework, transport interventions provide a very valuable policy instrument for poverty reduction. A transport investment project may foster economic growth, or target the transport needs of the poor, or directly generate employment opportunities for the poor. In any of these ways, the project contributes to poverty reduction.

**Multi-modal transit systems are crucial to equality---they can create a shift away from our car-based culture**

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

IV. The Road (or Bus or Bike) to Take: Transportation Policy Priorities for Civil and Human Rights Organizations Today’s transportation infrastructure perpetuates public health problems, environmental damage, and unequal opportunity. Although our nation will continue to be primarily dependent on automobiles for the foreseeable future, **we** also **must invest in equitable alternatives** that will benefit our economy, environment, and underserved communities. As we consider how to rebuild and rethink our transportation policies, we must make decisions with civil and human rights considerations in mind. This means that advocates must mobilize to educate and advocate for a shared vision of transportation equity. a. Transportation equity provides people with multiple transportation options Creating and maintaining affordable and accessible transportation options are priorities. **Ending the disproportionate investment in car-based transit must be a centerpiece of the transportation equity agenda**. Highways and streets without space for non-motorized traffic isolate those without access to cars and people with disabilities, force low-income people to overspend on transportation and forego other necessities, and contribute to pedestrian fatalities. Civil and human rights **advocates should encourage investments in “multi-modal” forms of transit, including sidewalks, bike lanes, and dedicated street and highway lanes for rapid bus transit that can connect urban and low-income people to jobs**. In addition, our transportation policy **should expand** and improve **service** for people who depend on public transportation, including older adults, people with disabilities, people in rural areas, and low-income people. New highways exacerbate transportation inequities by increasing transportation costs for these communities and potentially putting jobs and affordable housing out of reach. An equity agenda should favor incentives to fix existing infrastructure and develop vacant or underutilized property within metro areas. Although investment in non-automobile transportation options will undoubtedly benefit people with disabilities, policy makers must nonetheless seek guidance from accessibility experts when selecting projects in which to invest. People with disabilities live in every community, and the growing elderly population shares many of their concerns. Transportation planning must therefore concern more than geography; it must also be about accessibility and maximizing usability.

#### **Federal leadership is critical to interstate bus routes and metropolitan transit – states don’t cut it---acknowledging the federal government's responsibility to provide equitable transport is crucial to dismantling politically driven policies which perpetuate status quo hierarchies**

Schank 12 (Joshua Schank President & CEO Eno Center for Transportation, “The Federal Role in Transportation: Four Ideas for Greater Federal Involvement”, The Eno Center for Transportation is a neutral, non-partisan think-tank that promotes policy innovation and provides professional development opportunities across the career span of transportation professionals. http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-four-ideas-for-greater-federal-involvement EG)

The role of the federal government in daily life has been the subject of an ongoing national debate in this country since our founding. The 2012 Presidential Campaign will not resolve it, nor most likely will any single event, but it is an essential debate to have in all subject areas, and transportation is no exception. In fact, the role of the federal government in transportation is particularly challenging because so much of transportation is inherently local and yet the federal government plays a substantial and varying role, ranging from a primarily safety and regulatory role in freight rail and ports to strong funding role in highways and transit. Americans rarely look to the federal government to solve their transportation problems, and yet without the federal contribution, states and localities would face serious challenges in meeting transportation needs. 1. National Freight Plan and Discretionary Grant Program. It is inconceivable, and yet largely true, that the U.S. has never really put together a national, multi-modal plan for freight transportation. Not only is there is no national freight plan; there is no federal money available specifically for freight despite its obvious relationship to interstate commerce and our global competitiveness. Developing a national freight plan would be a challenging but worthwhile process of establishing where the investment needs are national in scope. This means moving beyond highways to consider rail and inland waterways, and access to seaports and airports. In light of the coming Panama Canal expansion, and its potential implications for changing trade patterns, there could be substantial new investments that needs to be made and others that should be avoided. Federal guidance and leadership could be crucial. Fortunately, the Senate authorization bill (S. 1813) moves in this direction by designating a primary freight network within one year. This represents a substantial step forward in recognizing the federal role in freight transportation. Unfortunately, S. 1813 also distributes money for the freight network entirely by formula, and it is almost entirely highway focused. Freight investments are by nature lumpy and distributing money for them by formula does little to ensure cost-effectiveness from a national perspective. The most cost-effective freight investments are often in relieving bottlenecks, which may require substantial capital investment in multiple modes but concentrated in one place. There is little incentive for states to invest precious formula dollars in these capital-intensive projects, but those same states might compete for discretionary dollars for those projects. 2. Airport Congestion Reduction. We often think of airports as local economic generators, and they are that, but some also have substantial national importance. The aviation network is dependent on large hub airports for the efficient and timely movement of passengers across the country and the world. A safe and reliable aviation network is essential for maintaining our competitiveness in the global economy. Unfortunately, we are in danger of losing our edge in this area because of congestion. Successful NextGen implementation could greatly alleviate the problem, but even if that happens airlines could take advantage of the new capacity and provide more frequent flights. Once economic growth picks up again we are likely to see airport congestion and delays increase as well. Airports such as Newark, San Francisco, and Chicago O’Hare already have approximately 30-40 percent of their flights delayed. Airports face substantial challenges in trying to tackle this issue on their own. The most widely recommended solution is pricing airport runways by time of day. But this politically unpopular solution has faced substantial opposition from communities such as smaller cities flying into hubs, or general aviation aircraft that are concerned about being effectively priced out of the market for a given airport. Congested airports would have a much greater chance of success if they were trying to tackle congestion in partnership with the federal government and other local transportation agencies. The federal role could be improved by dedicating a portion of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to provide grants to airports in regions that have a plan to work collaboratively to reduce congestion and overcome some of the political barriers to more effective pricing. Or the AIP could be retooled to set specific performance goals for airports and rewarding achievement. However it is done, there is a clear national interest at play here and the federal government needs to be more involved.

3. Interstate Bus Routes The federal government has an established role in interstate transportation. Though some might argue that the federal role in intercity passenger rail, for example, is overextended, few would argue that there should be no federal role at all in ensuring effective intercity transportation. And yet, there is little to no federal involvement in intercity bus transportation outside of safety regulation, despite the fact that, according to a report from Joseph Schweiterman at DePaul University, it is the fastest growing mode of intercity transportation in the U.S. This still underutilized mode has the potential to speed connections between metropolitan regions. Buses are more flexible than trains, more comfortable than airplanes, and unlike your person vehicle they are (safe) mobile offices and entertainment centers. The only problem is speed – this is where the federal role is needed. Congested highways are the biggest barriers to more effective intercity bus transportation. While it could be argued that managing congestion within a metropolitan region is not a federal responsibility, it is hard to argue that managing congestion that affects interstate travel does not fall at least in part to the federal government. At a minimum, U.S. DOT could designate high-priority intercity bus routes on the basis of demand and congestion. Even better would be federal discretionary grants to incentivize the creation of High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes on existing highways. While such grants could have numerous benefits for trucking and passenger vehicles as well, one of the criteria for awarding the grants could be the inclusion of intercity bus travel options. Even without uncongested routes, private competition on intercity bus routes has provided low fares and good service between many metropolitan regions. Imagine how much better it could be if there were free-flowing travel lanes that allowed buses and passengers greater certainty and speed of travel. 4. Metropolitan Transportation When experts and elected officials discuss narrowing the federal role, the issue of metropolitan transportation comes up sooner rather than later. Highway users dislike their funds being used for other modes, and proponents of smaller government are more likely to accept a federal role in interstate commerce than metropolitan transportation. The evidence of this argument can be seen in the House Republican proposal to remove the dedicated gas tax revenues for mass transit, and in the Senate Republican proposals to eliminate the Transportation Enhancements program, which provides funding for bicycle and pedestrian improvements (though neither of these are exclusive to metropolitan areas, they are primarily focused there). But this kind of thinking ignores several key factors. First, metropolitan areas are the engines of economic growth in this country, with 84 percent of the population and the majority of economic output in 47 of 50 states. If we don’t invest there, we risk our economic future as a nation. Second, it is in everyone’s interest to move beyond the issue of who is paying. So-called “user-fees” account for an ever-shrinking percentage of the federal program, and subsidies go every which way. While there is often concern expressed regarding the “subsidy” of mass transit by highway users, less concern seems to be expressed regarding the “subsidy” of rural states by more populous urban states. These are not actual subsidies, but the nature of a national system wherein not everyone gets back exactly what they pay in. Finally, metropolitan transportation cannot be though of as uni-modal because there is no metropolitan area that actually functions that way. They are all dependent on transit, bicycles, and walking to varying degrees and all of these modes must be supported by the federal system. Final Thoughts All of these ideas have a consistent theme – they require strong federal leadership to maximize our return on investment. Our freight system, airports, highways, and ports all require some federal coordination in order for the U.S. to effectively compete in the global economy. While we consider the federal role in transportation given the increasing possibility of diminished federal funding in the coming decades, these are areas where there not only needs to be a federal presence, but federal leadership. If local transportation decisions are seen as purely political, with little regard to performance outcomes or national goals, we will fall short of where we need to be as a nation. These transportation investments will require strong federal leadership to ensure that they remain primarily influenced by data, analysis, and desired outcomes.

### Cheating FW---Public Debates Good

#### Effective democratic deliberation about environmental justice is critical to community participation

**Sanchez 8** [Thomas W. Sanchez, Ph.D Environmental Studies, “An Equity Analysis of Transportation Funding”, <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/2812>, Fall 2008] SV

Decisions about community and regional development are most successful within a democratic framework. Effective outcomes are achieved when those participating have “a full awareness of their interests and have sufficient power to assure representativeness and equity in outcomes.”[1] However, in order to express those desires and preferences in a meaningful way, the public must be provided with the capacity to participate. A crucial component of any democratized planning process is the demystification of the decision-making process and transparency in communication of alternatives to and consequences of proposed policies.

### K of Security

**Security rhetoric formulates the basis of the current residential apartheid---focusing on securing the globe from threats justifies relegating violence done to the periphery as irrelevant**

Kuswa, 2k2 (Kevin, Director of Debate at U. of Richmond, “Suburbification, Segregation, and the Consolidation of the Highway Machine”, The Journal of Law in Society, 31.1, Lexis)

<One of the devastating memories of the highway and suburbia during the middle of the last century concerns race and class and the ways many impoverished and minority people were segregated and contained in certain city regions. How is power exercised in these instances? How can these histories be tied together to critique the effects of the highway machine? A relational notion of power can assist critical whiteness in confronting any attempts to govern through a spatial control of mobility and housing that promotes race and class divisions. Power no longer constitutes authority in a bipolar way, for the exercise of power produces positive and negative effects. More specifically, the racing and placing of populations occurs through the highway machine's exercise of pastoral power, not through a barricade set up by the military or forced internment. A concept like pastoral power turns away from analyzing situations in terms of "those with power" against "those without." Pastoral power, for Foucault, involves the individualization and totalization of power's objects: the subject and the flock. n62 Civil [\*55] institutions took it upon themselves to save and improve the citizenry, rather than simply governing the larger social body. Individuals are subject to rigid norms and groups are subjugated by state policies and enforcement. In a less abstract sense, the urban highway subjugates communities that are not able to access the highway, while people who do have access are subject to its restrictions and its path. The subject, or driver, desires easy access to employment as well as a domestic escape from the perceived dangers of city life. Meanwhile, the flock, or abstracted community, desires security and the comforts of modernity. The underside of the subject and the flock is, of course, the non-citizen and the non-community-the elements that must be purged and sanitized for the smooth functioning of society. This is how pastoral power produces subjectivities at the same time that it subjugates others. Through the highway machine, the noncitizen emerges as the residue of circulation and distribution-the immobile person contained in a trap of poverty and walled-in by the very structures designed to expand society's possibilities of travel. The have-nots become the move-nots, resigned to remain within a crowded cage contrasted with the adjacent freedom of superhighways and airports. Through the highway machine, the non-community emerges as the residue of out-migration and gentrification, effectively raising and depressing property rates to squeeze some people in and some people out. Drawing an analogy to a more popularized form of containment will serve to highlight the process. Greene relates the discourse of containment to United States foreign policy in the "third world," by showing how poverty and overpopulation had to be contained in the [\*56] name of democracy. n63 The borderlines between North and South (the North South gap) and between East and West (the East West divide or the Iron Curtain) became regions where containment worked to place and displace particular territories and populations. These logics appeared across the globe in the form of proxy wars (Angola, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Afghanistan); in the emergence of spheres of influence (the bear in the backyard and the domino theory); and in the separation of worlds into the industrialized first world, the industrializing or communist-bloc second world, and the underdeveloped or newly independent third world. Containment worked in these contexts to isolate conditions of political instability, poverty, and rapid population growth. These conditions then marked places that could breed communism or pose a potential threat to the West. Greene focuses on how the population control apparatus adopted containment rhetoric to further birth control, family planning, and health promotion in the so-called third world. This article uses Greene's concept to make a brief comment on the tropes of "cleanliness," "the pristine," "health," and "whiteness" operating within containment. n64 From there, we turn toward the ways these discourses produce racial divisions within American cities. Early in his account of the population apparatus, Greene notes "discourse strategies offer the means for making the conduct of a population visible as a problem" and "a discourse strategy exists as a norm for evaluating [\*57] the welfare of a population." n65 We recognize, though, that these discursive strategies are material and not just descriptive, that rhetorical positioning operates alongside ethical judgment, and that discursive foundations allow the exercise of power to be enabling and disabling at any given moment. n66 Many strategies circulate together to make certain populations visible and judge their productivity. Deploying the need for health, for instance, discursive strategies began to associate the health of the individual with the health of the nation and the health of the social body. A number of techniques combine to determine which populations are unhealthy and how those populations can be distinguished, separated, and contained. The health of a given population works figuratively and literally (metaphorically and physically). As Greene contends: "the individual health/social health couplet allows the language of public health and disease to be deployed in order to pathologize particular practices as 'unhealthy' for both the individual and the social body." n67 Greene's link between the discourse of health and containment is clear in the emergence of a Malthusian couple and state promotion of birth control, making the notion of "racing and placing populations" a significant one to import to the intersection between the suburb and whiteness. n68>

### Impact Calc---Conventional Risk Calc Bad

#### Conventional-risk analysis is rigged against the poor---including an ethical commitment to transportation is necessary to correct for pure utilitarianism's blind-spots

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

Transport sector operations do have important direct impacts on the poor. In particular, some problems inherent in the transport project evaluation process and in transport market structures often adversely affect the poor more than the rich. Because these adverse impacts on the poor contribute to both relative poverty and absolute poverty, heightened awareness on these distributive impacts is very important for appreciating the contribution of the transport sector to poverty reduction. This awareness needs to be translated in systematic manner into the formulation of national transport policies and investment programs, and into the selection and design of transport development projects. Unfortunately, there have been very few studies of the distributive impact of transport in general, and transport operations in particular. The consequences for the poor of transport projects, external effects, and government regulations have not been adequately documented. 4.30 Conventional cost-benefit analysis does not take distributive impact into account and hence does not inform government decision-makers of the social groups that stand to gain and lose as a result of their decisions. Nor does it inform decision-makers of the effect of projects on poverty reduction. In addition, since cost-benefit analysis involves adding the gains and losses to all affected groups on the same basis, it may be argued that it involves a selection orientation against low-income groups. To overcome this orientation, one approach is to introduce distributional weights that assign different weights to money gains or losses to different income groups. In general, this approach is not appropriate. Distributional judgments should be resolved through political processes. However, these processes can be assisted in a rigorous way by extending the conventional cost-benefit analysis framework to cover distributional outcomes and to display this information in a balance sheet format as an adjunct to the conventional cost benefit analysis. Analysis of distributive outcomes can be difficult, however. The practical extent to which it can be undertaken needs to be judged carefully; for example, a strong(er) case prevails in situations where the distributive outcome is likely to differ significantly across alternatives, and especially where there is little difference in efficiency among alternatives.

### Transport Solves Poverty

#### Transportation inequity and a lack of suburban public transportation are the primary cause of inner-city poverty

Glaeser et al. 8 – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; January 2008, “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 1-24, p. Elsevier)

We follow LeRoy and Sonstelie [23] and argue that the primary reason for central city poverty is public transportation. The large financial costs of automobiles make them unattractive to the poor; public transportation offers a time-intensive alternative that will be more appealing to those with low incomes. Public transportation relies on high densities, so if inner cities have public transportation and suburbs do not, then this can explain the urbanization of the poor.3 This view does not require a monocentric model. If suburbs are a complete urban environment built around the car, and inner cities are rival areas built around public transportation, then it is easy to understand why the poor live and work in inner cities.

After revisiting the multiple mode model in Section 3, Section 4 calibrates the model to see whether it can explain the centralization of the poor.We use data from the 2001 National Household Transportation Survey to estimate the time costs of taking public transportation and driving. We estimate that public transportation is two to three times more important than the income elasticity of demand for land in explaining the central location of the poor. Indeed, including transport modes suggests that we should always expect the poor to centralize, at least at US levels of income inequality.

#### Transportation projects reduce poverty

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

In line with the direct and indirect approaches to poverty reduction, development projects in the transport sector can roughly be divided into three categories: (a) projects that focus on poverty, (b) projects oriented toward efficiency and growth, and (c) efficiency- and growth-oriented projects with components that focus on poverty. The concern of this paper is a more detailed understanding of how transport improvements, either focused on poverty or on growth, contribute to poverty reduction. 2.7 In general, a transport project is expected to contribute to poverty reduction through its indirect impacts on economic growth or its direct impact on personal welfare of the poor. What exact impact the project would have on poverty reduction hinges on both the type of infrastructure or services and the areas and people the project serve. It also depends on the operating environment of the project, particularly market structures and government regulations. In general, local access roads in poor rural and urban areas make only a modest contribution to national income growth, but they are likely to have a direct and significant impact on the daily life of the poor. On the other hand, inter-city transport modes such as trunk roads, rail and shipping are of strategic significance to a national economy. They are provided with the objective to stimulate and facilitate national income growth; their impacts on poverty reduction are likely to be indirect. 2.8 The process through which the benefits of transport investments and policies lead to improvements in the standard of living of the low-income groups often involves many links, and the final general equilibrium outcomes and incidence pattern across various groups are very difficult to predict. To get some idea of the key relationships, a somewhat simplified process is illustrated by Figure 2.1. Investment in the transport sector improves access to economic opportunities by reducing transport costs. Provided transport market structures are reasonably competitive, this will be reflected in a reduction in prices for both freight and passenger services. Again, under competitive conditions, significant predictable consequences will result. These include lower market prices for final products (both rural products and consumer goods), spatial extension of the market (due to the transport-induced changes in production and consumption patterns), higher personal mobility, and stimulation of socio-economic activities. In general, this dynamic process can be expected to benefit all income groups in society in the form of real income effects and increased opportunities.7 2.9 In addition to improving accessibility, transport investment affects employment. The provision of transport services, including the construction and maintenance of transport infrastructure, generates demand for labor (often unskilled labor) and provides income-earning opportunities for the poor. If a transport project generates jobs for the poor who are otherwise unemployed or under-employed, it contributes to the reduction of poverty. In many developing countries, the construction aspect of transport sector development is often viewed equally as important as the service aspect of the sector in promoting economic growth.2.10 Finally, it must be aware that transport may have adverse impact on the poor. Forexample, transport investment typically involves some environmental impact. If the effect is negative, the poor are the least able to respond, adjust or compensate; they may be the most vulnerable and the most “at risk.” Impacts of Transport on Economic Growth Sustained economic growth generally contributes to the alleviation of absolute poverty. Therefore, understanding the role of transport in economic growth is central to an appreciation of the role of transport in poverty reduction. 2.12 Transport provides intermediate services to facilitate interactions between productive activities. The micro-economic mechanisms through which the benefits of transport investment are translated into income growth are quite well recognized.8 Transport investment reduces the cost of assembling intermediate inputs for production (raw materials, energy, labor, other intermediate products, and information) from different locations, directly reducing the cost of production. Reduced cost and improved quality in transport services also reduces the delivered price of products and hence promotes regional and international trade, making it possible for agriculture to commercialize, for industry to specialize, and for production and employment to expand by exploiting scale economies. Transport investment contributes to economic diversification as well, which enables exploitation of economies of scope and increases the economy’s ability to handle risks. In a multitude of ways through these mechanisms, transport contributes to economic growth.

#### Current policies have caused inner cities to both create and attract poverty

Glaeser et al. 8 – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; January 2008, “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 1-24, p. Elsevier)

The first five rows describe urbanization of poverty in the US and in the four major census regions. In the US as a whole, the poverty rate is 19.9 percent in central cities and 7.5 percent in metropolitan areas outside of the central city. The poverty rate outside of metropolitan areas is also high, but that is not the focus of this paper.

The second and third rows show that the biggest city–suburb poverty gaps are in the Northeast and the Midwest. In the Northeast, the poverty rate is 14.2 percent higher in the central cities than it is in the suburbs. In the Midwest, the poverty rate is more than 14.2 percent higher than it is in the suburbs. The fourth and fifth rows show the poverty gaps for the West and the South. In both of these areas, the city–suburb poverty gap remains, but the gaps are lower. In particular, the city–suburb poverty gap in the West is only 8.6 percentage points. Any theory about the location of the poor should also be able to explain these regional differences.

In the next rows of the table, we examine the possibility that the connection between city residence and poverty is treatment (i.e., cities make people poor) not selection (i.e., the poor disproportionately move to central cities). While ghettos may exacerbate poverty, these four columns show that the selection of the poor into the city is intense. The city–suburb poverty rate gap for recent movers is generally larger than the city–suburb poverty rate gap for long-term residents. Among people who came to their MSA in the last five years, the poverty rate is 21.3 percent in the central city and 10 percent in the suburbs. Among people who switched homes within the same MSA in the last five years, the poverty rate is 21.8 percent in the city and 10.4 percent in the suburbs. The natural explanation of these facts is that cities are attracting the poor, not just making them.

#### The concentration of poor people in cities causes rich people to move out – that creates a cycle of deepening segregation

Glaeser et al. 8 – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; January 2008, “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 1-24, p. Elsevier)

Many theories that seem to explain the urbanization of the poor actually explain only the separation of the non-poor and the poor. Some authors argue that crime, schools and other urban social problems explain the flight of the rich from cities (see Mieszkowski and Mills [26], Mills and Lubuele [29]). These arguments are surely right. People who leave the cities often cite these urban social problems as a primary reason for their exodus (see Katz, Kling and Liebman [22]). Suburban governments that cater to wealthier voters surely help attract the rich. The rich are willing to pay to avoid proximity to the poor, perhaps because of crime, weak public schools, or discriminatory tastes.7

However, urban social problems and the presence of minorities do not explain urban poverty. Urban social problems derive more from the concentration of poor people in cities rather than anything intrinsic to cities themselves.8 As such, urban social problems create a multiplier effect where an initial attraction of the poor to cities will then be greatly magnified to create significant poor/non-poor segregation.9 Perhaps the poor just ended up in the city center by chance and the rest followed. But this view seems hard to reconcile with the fact that the poor are overrepresented in the central cities of every one of America’s metropolitan areas. A satisfying theory of urban centralization should explain not only why the poor and the non-poor live apart, but also why, conditional upon the poor and non-poor living apart, the poor choose to live closer to the city center.

#### Access to public transportation attracts poverty

Glaeser et al. 8 – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; January 2008, “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 1-24, p. Elsevier) [note: CBD = Central Business District]

We now present evidence on the connection between poverty and public transportation. We first look within cities at a point in time and look at whether the poor live in places where there is access to public transportation.14 Next, we look at whether poverty rates increase in places where access to public transportation has increased. In the next section, we calibrate the condition suggested by the LeRoy and Sonstelie [23] modified-AMM model.

In Table 4, we turn to tract level data from the year 2000 and test whether, in a cross section of census tracts, the poor live close to public transportation. We have two distinct samples: sixteen cities where we have data on rail access (see Baum-Snow and Kahn [4]); and the outer boroughs of New York City, where we have data on subway stops.

Using both samples, we first regress the log of household median income on distance from the CBD. This is meant to measure the extent of the sorting of the poor in each of the two samples. Then we control for a census tract’s access to public transit to study how this affects the income/distance to the CBD relationship. We estimate a piecewise linear (spline) regression allowing the coefficient on distance to change at three and ten miles.

In column (1), we present results based on the sixteen city sample. The coefficient on distance is 0.099 within three miles and 0.062 for tracts between three and ten miles of the city center. In column (2), we control for a census tract’s distance to the nearest rail transit line. Column (2) shows that including public transportation access increases explanatory power and eliminates one third of the positive relationship between distance and income for distances less than ten miles from the city center.15

Table 4, columns (3) and (4) focus on New York City’s outer boroughs of Queens, Brooklyn and the Bronx (Staten Island has no subways and subway coverage is far too dense in Manhattan to provide any meaningful variation). For this sample, no subway stops have been added since 1942; thus any endogeneity on stop locations stems from poverty levels of at least 48 years earlier. As many neighborhoods have changed radically during this period, we believe that these locations can be thought of as having some degree of exogeneity. The results are quite compatible with the earlier samples. Public transportation usage appears to strongly predict poverty and to explain a substantial amount of the connection between proximity and poverty.

In Table 5, we look at the effects of public transportation expansions on tract-level poverty. For our 16-city sample, public transit construction between 1980 and 2000 increased the supply of communities with close access to rail transit. As discussed in Baum-Snow and Kahn [4], these transit expansions were intended to connect suburban locations to the Central Business District. In Table 5, we look at whether poverty rates rose in tracts where rail transportation became more accessible. Presumably, public transportation’s appeal to the poor arises because it eliminates the need to own a car. As such, we look at areas where new construction made it possible to walk to a transit line. Using data for the 16 metro areas, we estimate

Poverty Rate = α +β ∗ Proximity to Transit+ε. (10)

In this regression, the key explanatory variable is a dummy that equals one if a census tract is within one mile of rail transit. In estimating this regression, we exploit a tract-level panel dataset where we observe each census tract in 1980, 1990 and 2000. In regression (1), we include metropolitan area fixed effects, year fixed effects, and MSA by year fixed effects. Tracts that are within a mile of rail transit have 4 percentage points higher poverty rates. In columns (2) and (4), we include tract fixed effects, and thus we are examining how tract poverty rates change as some census tracts are “treated” with increased access to rail transit due to city-level rail transit expansions.We find small but statistically significant results. Based on the results in columns (2) and (4), a treated tract experiences a 0.004 percentage point increase in poverty relative to nontreated tracts in the same metropolitan area that are equidistant to the CBD. While the results in Table 5 are modest, they continue to suggest the positive impact of access to public transportation on the location of the poor.

Anecdotal information also suggests that changes in public transportation can lead to increased poverty. For example, Harlem’s evolution into a ghetto begins with the extension of the subway into that area (see Osofsky [31]). As public transportation came to Harlem, African Americans moved from less-segregated, less-attractive areas closer to the city center into this newly accessible place.

#### Statistical evidence proves the relationship between transportation and poverty

Glaeser et al. 8 – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; January 2008, “Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 1-24, p. Elsevier) [note: CBD = Central Business District]

6. Further implications

We now turn to three additional implications of the transport mode model. The first implication is that in areas where only one mode is used, the rich should live close to the city center. The second implication is that location patterns should change when public transit infrastructure changes the location patterns of the rich. The third implication is that in cities with decentralized employment, poverty should be less decentralized.

6.1. Car zones

If our analysis is correct, and εA Y < εW Y (i.e., the poor live in the central city because of public transportation, not because of land area), then within areas where only one mode of transport is used, the non-poor should live closer to the center of town.

There is really no area in America where cars are not an important part of transport, but in many areas of the US, only cars are used. If public transportation explains the centralization of poverty, then we should expect the rich to live closer to the city center in those metropolitan areas where almost nobody commutes using public transit. To identify these metropolitan areas, we examine public transit use in census tracts between 5 and 15 miles from the CBD. For each metropolitan area in that mileage range, we identify the census tract with the maximum public transit use. We drop all metropolitan areas where the tract with the highest public transit share of commuters exceeds 2.5%. This leaves us a sample of 99 metropolitan areas. In column (1) of Table 6 we refer to these metropolitan areas as the “car zone.”

Column (1) of Table 6 shows a significant negative relationship between distance from CBD and income in car zones. In an area where only one mode of transportation is being used, richer people appear to live closer to the city center. This suggests that the existence of multiple modes of transport is crucial for understanding why the poor live in cities.

6.2. Public transportation and the rich

As a second test of the theory, we look at the effects of subways across metropolitan areas. The theory predicts that the transition from poor to non-poor will occur when cars replace public transportation. If a different transportation technology changes the point at which cars substitute for public transportation, this will change the point where urban poverty is replaced by higher income areas. We examine the subset of metropolitan areas that have subways. The effect of these subways is to move the public transit zone much further out, since the time cost per mile of subways is much lower than the time cost per mile of buses. In column (2) of Table 6, we examine the relationship between tract median income and tract distance from the CBD in subway cities and non-subway cities. The subway cities include Boston, Chicago, New York City and Philadelphia. In subway cities, incomes first decline with respect to distance from the CBD, out to three miles. Beyond three miles from the CBD, income increases as the distance to the CBD increases. In contrast, for non-subway cities, incomes rise with distance from the CBD for tracts within three miles of the city center. In column (3) of Table 6, we examine the relationship between tract public transit use and tract distance from the CBD in subway cities and non-subway cities. Subway cities feature a positive relationship between public transit use and distance to the CBD for tracts within three miles of the CBD.

Figure 3, panels (a) and (b) show the patterns of income and public transportation usage in subway cities and non-subway cities respectively. In both cases, income and public transportation usage track one another (note that we have inverted income values with respect to the vertical axis). In cities with subways, public transit use remains high even at distances relatively far from the city center. In the subway cities, near the city center median income falls with distance from the CBD as predicted by the three-mode model (assuming a zone in which both poor and nonpoor individuals use public transit). The rise in income and fall in public transit usage beyond three miles from the CBD in subway cities presumably pick up the shift from public transit to car usage by high-income individuals.

\

#### Public transit expansions are progressive and help the urban poor

Baum-Snow and Kahn 5 – \*Stephen Robert Assistant Professor of Economics at Brown University AND \*\*Professor of Economics at UCLA (Nathaniel, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago; and Matthew E., Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; “Effects of Urban Rail Transit Expansions: Evidence from Sixteen Cities, 1970–2000,” <http://www.econ.brown.edu/fac/nathaniel_baum-snow/brook_final.pdf>) [note: CBD = central business district]

Our empirical work suggests that there are distributional consequences from expanding rail transit infrastructure. Suburban workers who commute by car are likely to gain little from improved transit, while bus commuters who work in the CBD enjoy large time savings in many cities. Since bus riders tend to be poorer people, this suggests that rail transit expansions are progressive. This is a contentious point that merits future research. Transportation scholars have argued that an unintended consequence of rail transit expansion is bus coverage deterioration due to budget reallocations to pay for the new transit lines.45 If this is true and if the poor are more likely to take the bus than rail transit, then transit expansion could be regressive public policy.46

#### A lack of transportation creates a cycle of poverty for the urban poor

Glaeser et al. 2k – professor of economics at Harvard University (Edward L., research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research; Matthew E. Kahn, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, Professor at the UCLA Institute of the Environment, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Public Policy, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, former Visiting Professor at Harvard University and Stanford University, former professor at Columbia and the Fletcher School at Tufts University; and Jordan Rappaport, senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City; April 2000, “Why Do the Poor Live in Cities?” Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper No. 1891, http://www.perpustakaan.depkeu.go.id/FOLDERJURNAL/HIER1891.pdf)

Traditional housing market explanations cannot explain the sorting of the poor into central cities. The income elasticity of demand for land is just too low. Instead, we find that transportation-mode choice plays a key role in explaining income sorting. The role of public transportation appears to be augmented in older cities by government programs that disproportionately favor the poor. In the newer cities, the puzzle of centralization of the poor is also explained in part by the decentralization of employment: as jobs are decentralized, high wage households are also decentralized.

There is no question that rich-poor segregation is a general phenomenon, much of which is unrelated to the urban theories discussed herein, Instead, we have argued that factors like schools and crime should be seen as a result of the poor choosing to live in cities rather than being the reason for their doing so. However, this sort of secondary effect may in practice be much more important in people’s decisions than transportation and it may act as a multiplier so that an initial incentive pulling the poor into cities will create massive sorting.

Public transportation theory offers the possibility to explain income-sorting patterns across nations. Many authors have noted that in many European cities the poor live in suburbs (see Brueckner, Thisse and Zenou, 1997). High gas taxes and generous subsidization of public transportation mean that the high car mileage associated with American-style suburbs are unattractive to most middle-income Europeans. Furthermore, European central city governments are often national and often subsidize the rich rather than the poor. Thus the combination of public transportation and government can explain the U.S. – Europe differences in the location of the poor.

There are two policy implications of this work. First, our findings on the importance of public transportation suggests that public transportation is an important policy instrument which can influence the location decisions of the poor (as argued by Meyer, Kain and Wohl, 1965). Second, the importance of political boundaries may mean that there are politically created distortions that artificially induce the poor to crowd into cities.

#### A lack of transportation mobility destroys the lives of the poor

Giuliano 5 – Professor in the Sol Price School of Public Policy at University of Southern California (Genevieve, Ph.D. in Social Sciences from UC Irvine, Ferraro Chair in Effective Local Government and Senior Associate Dean of Research and Technology in the Sol Price School of Public Policy at University of Southern California, Director of the METRANS joint USC and California State University Long Beach Transportation Center, former Chair of the Executive Committee of the Transportation Research Board, 2005, “Low Income, Public Transit, and Mobility,” *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1927, pp. 63-70, http://www.metapress.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/content/g6365101635268q8/fulltext.pdf)

The poor may be disadvantaged in at least three ways as a result of limited mobility. First, the poor may be captive consumers of goods, services, or medical care. Retail establishments may be able to charge higher prices when consumers are limited to local neighborhood stores; social, recreational, and medical opportunities may be limited. Studies have demonstrated the scarcity of major supermarkets and banks in inner-city areas (15, 16) and have shown that inner-city and minority residents pay more for groceries because of the absence of major chains (17 ). There is also evidence of limited access to public parks (18). Although medical facilities are often located in inner-city areas, minorities and low-income populations frequently have less access to health care services, and transportation is commonly cited as a significant barrier (19).

The second dimension of disadvantage is what has come to be called “spatial mismatch.” The concept of spatial mismatch, developed by Kain (20), is that suburbanization has been selective—the more affluent, white population has suburbanized, while the minority (and predominantly poor) population has remained in the central city. Differential rates of suburbanization are explained by many factors, including exclusionary zoning practices and discrimination in the housing market. As jobs have suburbanized (particularly low-wage jobs), central-city workers have experienced a relative decline in job accessibility, which has in turn led to both higher unemployment rates and longer commutes for those who are employed. Less job accessibility implies fewer job opportunities, and hence less likelihood of finding a job, while longer commutes imply lower net wages. The spatial mismatch hypothesis has been tested by comparing unemployment rates, commute distances, or net wages across otherwise similar workers living in central cities and suburbs (21, 22). Despite extensive research, the evidence on spatial mismatch remains mixed.

The third source of disadvantage is the cost of transport services. The poor pay relatively higher transit fares per unit of service than the nonpoor. The poor take shorter trips and are less likely to travel during peak periods, compared with the nonpoor. Flat fares, or fares based only loosely on trip distance, mean that short trips have a higher price per unit (23, 24). Because transit demand is higher in poor areas, productivity is higher, fares contribute a higher proportion of operating costs, and subsidies per trip are lower. Shifts in transit financing to more regressive revenue sources have further increased the financial burden on the poor.

Low-income households also spend a much higher proportion of after-tax income on transportation, and the differences are increasing (25). Relatively high expenditures are explained by the cost of car ownership and increasing rates of car ownership among the poor. It has been argued that one explanation for extensive car ownership even among the poorest households is the lack of high-quality transit service. Essentially, public transit is such a poor substitute for the automobile that the poor incur the expense of car ownership to obtain the mobility that a car provides (26).

### Transport Solves Poverty---Narrow Definitions Bad

#### Good transportation is critical for poverty alleviation

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

Poverty reduction is the World Bank’s overarching objective. It will remain so since poverty persists as a pervasive and devastating condition in most developing countries. Poverty has many root causes. While it is primarily related to very low-incomes, it is manifested in many dimensions, especially malnutrition, ill health, and illiteracy. Attempts to alleviate poverty basically follow two broad approaches: indirect and direct. The indirect approach relies on broadly based economic growth to generate income-earning opportunities for the poor, while the direct approach targets assistance to the poor for their specific basic needs, especially food, health care, and education. 1.2 Because both approaches to poverty reduction require adequate means of moving people and goods, transport development becomes a crucial complementary factor in the process of poverty alleviation. Accordingly, transport is an important sector in the World Bank’s lending operations and its policy dialogue with borrowing member countries. Annual lending for the sector has remained steady at between 12 and 15 percent of overall Bank lending over the past decade. Currently, the number and value of transport projects as a share of the active portfolio is second only to agriculture and rural development. 1.3 While the importance of the transport sector in economic and social development has long been recognized, transport sector operations are rarely considered part of the Bank’s direct interventions for poverty alleviation. Bank operations in other sectors such as agriculture, education, health, and water and sanitation infrastructure are constantly emphasized for their direct role in poverty reduction.1 Transport tends to be viewed as contributing to poverty reduction only indirectly, that is, through its contribution to economic growth. 1.4 This view of transport may account for the very limited treatment of poverty issues in the Bank’s transport sector operations in general, and transport project design in particular. A 1995 Bank operations evaluation report indicated that there was little formal accounting for poverty in the Bank’s transport operations.2 Also, a recent transport sector policy review paper recognized a need to improve the treatment of poverty issues in the Bank’s transport sector operations, and to incorporate strategies and investments into Bankwide efforts at poverty alleviation.

### Transport Solves Poverty---Rural Specific

#### Transportation is vital to rural economies---stimulates ag output

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

The impact of transport on productivity is somewhat different in rural and urban areas in terms of the micro-economic mechanisms. Transport plays a pivotal role in promoting agricultural production and commercialization. This is most easily appreciated in terms of the von Thünen theory of the location of agriculture land use.15 Transport improvements reduce the cost of shipping agricultural products to market and extend the distance to break-even locations, thereby expanding the area of land under cultivation, and expanding the production of exports. Moreover, transport improvements reduce production costs by lowering the delivered price of inputs, including capital and information (the latter by facilitating increased speed of know-how and technological diffusion). Consequently, they increase net farm gate prices and raise farmer incomes, although the extent hinges on the competitiveness of the transport service market. 2.21 These impacts are confirmed by various impact studies, three of which are noted here. The first study was based on a survey of 129 villages in various parts of Bangladesh.16 The study categorized the villages into two groups based on an aggregate index developed to reflect the ease of access of a village to various services such as markets, schools, banks, and local administrative offices. Villages with better access were found to be significantly better off in a number of areas including agricultural production, household incomes, wage incomes of landless labor, health, and the participation of women in the economy. 2.22 The second study used data from eighty-five randomly selected districts of India to examine the role of rural roads, among other factors, in agricultural investment and output.17 The study found that road investment contributed directly to the growth of agricultural output, to increased use of fertilizer, and to commercial bank expansion. 2.23 The third study examined the socio-economic impacts of improvements to rural roads in Morocco.18 The study compared conditions in the areas of the project roads, five to ten years after project completion, to the situation prior to the improvements (“before-after” the project), and to the conditions in comparison roads that were located nearby and were not subject to improvements during the project period (“with-without” the project). The study found that the benefits of paving rural roads extended considerably beyond the improvement of road use efficiency in terms of lower cost and higher quality. The extended benefits included major changes in the agricultural economy, including higher outputs, transformation of the agricultural output mix from low-value cereals to high-value fruit orchards, and increased use of modern inputs, especially fertilizers. Moreover, improved access to education and health facilities increased enrollment rates in rural schools, as well as the frequency of visits to health care services, and enabled the recruitment of professional personnel to staff schools and health facilities. Again, positive feedback from higher rural incomes may have contributed to reverse causality.

### Transport Solves Poverty---Urban Specific

#### Transportation stimulates urban economies---expands market access and productivity

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

2.24 In urban areas, social and economic interactions are much more spatially intensive than in rural areas. Housing, jobs, and public facilities are located in proximity in order to take advantage of the economies of agglomeration. Most of the urban activities have a distinctive daily cycle. This close proximity of activities, both in location and timing, requires a highly efficient transport system. When an urban transport system becomes deficient, urban productivity declines and the standard of living for urban residents worsens. 2.25 Because transport cost is a key determinant of locations of urban activities, transport improvements can expand the location choices of both firms and households. In particular, transport improvement can help improve the competitiveness of small firms and can facilitate the entry of new firms into a market.19 Transport improvement also increases the efficiency of operation of the labor market and labor participation rates. The combination of these factors increases urban productivity and urban household incomes. 2.26 The rapid urbanization and income growth in developing countries have generated a great deal of pressure on urban transport infrastructure. This results in serious traffic congestion. Congestion increases transport costs for both freight and commuters. Higher cost for freight transport and higher commuting cost that requires employers to pay higher wages both increase production costs. While providing adequate access is the major task in rural transport, improving transport efficiency is perhaps the major issue in urban transport.

### Transport Solves Poverty/Jobs

#### Transportation Projects uniquely decrease poverty

Pollack 9 (Ethan Pollack, writer for the Economic Policy Institute and worked as a staff member for President Obama’s National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, “Transportation investments reduce income inequality”, April 2, 2009, http://www.epi.org/publication/snapshots\_20090402/)¶ The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provides an important but small down-payment on the repair and modernization of our infrastructure (though a larger and more-permanent commitment is needed). One benefit of this public investment is that it will help reduce hourly wage inequality, which has been growing for decades and represents the single largest impediment to raising the living standards of typical American workers. Much (though far from all) of this rise in wage inequality is attributable to the de-unionization of the workforce1 and the growing wage advantage afforded to those with a college degree.2 Greater investment in surface transportation infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, mass transit, and rail—as well as green investments in energy efficiency and the electric grid—would push against these trends. Consider transportation investment: According to research that will be presented at an upcoming EPI event, workers in jobs created or supported by these investments are less likely to have a college degree and more likely to be union members compared to workers in the overall economy. Despite employing workers with less education on average, fewer of these jobs are low-wage jobs. Green investments—including mass transit, but also energy efficiency, electric grid, etc.—result in very similar job characteristics and are thus equally effective at reducing wage inequality. Notes¶ 1. Since 1979, unionization rates have fallen by more than half, from 27% of the workforce to 12.3%. Research by DiNardo, Fortin, and Lemeuix (1992) shows how this has led to greater wage inequality.¶ 2. In 1979 college workers earned wages that were 50% higher than those of non-graduates (holding other worker characteristics constant), while by 2007 that advantage had risen to 80%.

**current transpo policy destroys economic equality**

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

b. Transportation policy affects access to economic opportunity i. **Current transportation policy fails to bridge the growing divide between many Americans and job opportunities** According to the Brookings Institution, by 2006,45 percent of jobs in our 98 largest metro areas were located more than 10 miles from the urban core. 14 While jobs are increasingly moving to suburbs and remote exurbs, **transportation options to and within these areas have not increased**. As a result, low-income and minority populations, who disproportionately live in urban cores, 15 face disproportionate barriers to securing and remaining in these jobs. Most of the outlying areas where an increasing percentage of American jobs are located are accessible only by car. This disproportionately harms peopleof color: 19 percent of African Americans and 13.7percent of Latinos lack access to automobiles, compared with only 4.6 percent of Whites. 17 Lack of publictransportation options also impedes efforts to reducepoverty—three out of ve jobs that are suitable for welfare-to-work participants are not accessible by public transportation. In the suburbs, where poverty is on therise, health care providers, social services, educational institutions and jobs are dispersed over a larger areawith few public transportation options or walking routes.With car ownership costing upwards of $9,000 per year,**the suburban poor face untenable options: isolation fromwork and services or spending nearly half their income on transportation.** 18 People with disabilities in car-dependent areas havelittle or no accessible, affordable transportation options.Those in metropolitan cores, though more likely to haveaccess to sidewalks, rail, and bus service, have limitedaccess to growing job markets in outlying areas. ii. Transportation has the potential to create jobs that benet low-income people and minorities Our investments in transportation generate hundredsof thousands of well-paying jobs each year. But jobsin the transportation construction workforce havedisproportionately been occupied by White males, withwomen occupying only 2.5 percent of these jobs andAfrican Americans occupying only 6 percent of theeight million people employed in the transportationconstruction industry in 2008. 20 By prioritizing construction far from urban centers in areas not accessible by transit, our current policy injures urban dwellers twice over. Because of earlier transit policy decisions, low-income people don’t haveaccess to construction jobs in outlying areas. And once 4 construction is complete, low-income people don’thave access to the new transportation routes. When wecontinue to prioritize investment in outlying areas, weincrease the number of jobs that are out of reach for low-income people.At the same time, investment leaves rural Americansbehind. According to the 2000 census, close to 80percent of Americans live in metropolitan areas. 21 Those in rural areas often face challenges accessing jobs inrural areas or traveling to jobs in the urban core.

#### Better public transportation is a lifeline for the poor that limits economic equality

Chen 7 – former Executive Director and founding CEO of Smart Growth America (Don, Senior Program Officer at the Ford Foundation, member of the Boards of Directors of West Harlem Environmental Action, Grist Magazine, the Institute for Location Efficiency, and the Growth Management Leadership Alliance, 2/1/07, *Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice, And Regional Equity*, pp. 301-302, p. Google Books)

How fast can the truly disadvantaged chase after opportunities? In most places, the bus isn’t fast enough, or (more likely) it doesn’t even go from here to there. But chase they must. Residents of declining older neighborhoods have far fewer job opportunities to pursue. The highways that provide accessibility for drivers also represent a barrier to those who can neither drive nor take public transit. This phenomenon is called "spatial mismatch," the notion that the urban poor in the United States are increasingly incapable of reaching job opportunities in distant suburban areas because of transportation and geographic limitations. The spatial mismatch literature begins in the 1960s and by now consists of a solid empirical base of supporting research (Kain 1992; Fernandez 1994).

Most efforts to address spatial mismatch are often described as welfare-to-work or access to jobs programs, which tend to include reverse-commute public transit services to suburban job locations, These certainly have some value. Public transit is a lifeline for millions of America’s poor, and roughly 40 percent of U.S. public transit riders are low-income people. Most transit systems don’t get people everywhere they need to go, however. Even in places with excellent transit services, welfare recipients still face serious mobility problems because jobs are increasingly located in areas that lack the population and activity densities that justify transit routes. During the past decade, research in the Cleveland, Boston, and Atlanta regions found that a startlingly low percentage of entry—level jobs were accessible via public transportation (Coulton, Verma, and Guo 1996; Lacombe 1998; Rich 1997).

This lack of reliable mobility choices hurts people who are trying to balance job demands with family responsibilities. For adult welfare recipients, this means juggling day care, education, training, work (often shift work), and other duties, all of which require individuals to be assiduously prompt. This is especially difficult for welfare recipients in rural areas, where transit services run less frequently and are subsidized more heavily. Another dimension to the challenge of providing transit services to the working poor is the tendency for suburban transit services to be better supported and funded than those for urban low-income areas. This problem is partly the result of agencies’ efforts to increase ridership among suburban commuters—measures that are designed more to address traffic congestion and boost agency revenues.2

### Transport Solves Health/Enviro/Race

#### Improving public transportation is necessary to reduce social divisions across multiple lines divisions and improve overall human wellbeing

Mann 96 (Eric Mann, Eric Mann is the director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles and a co-founder of the Bus Riders Union. The Strategy Center is a “think tank/act tank” that trains organizers and initiates high visibility environmental justice, mass transportation, and civil rights campaigns, “A NEW VISION

FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION”, 1996, http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf)

The Billions for Buses Plan: For Once, Mass Transportation for the Masses

Los Angeles could have a first-class public mass transit system, serving low-income people, well-paid working people and even the upper middle class, if they are willing, that is, to mingle with “the masses.” It could serve Latinos, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Native Ameri-cans and whites, women and men, inner city and suburbs, students, the elderly, and the disabled. In theory, this first class mass transit system could dramatically reduce auto use, and reduce noxious and lethal emissions from autos, thereby improving the public health. It could bring low-income work-ers to their jobs, help out-of-work workers look for jobs before President Clinton’s “five year and starve” rule takes effect, serve night-shift janitors and day-shift professionals. By dramatically reducing auto use, it could generate more pedestrian centers, bringing the races together through a transportation system that is more social and far more rich culturally than the private automobile. By dramatically reducing fares, increasing service, and giving high-speed buses the right-of-way, it could increase daily mass transit use—some estimate doubling the present level of bus riders from 350,000 to 700,000 per day over a decade of consistent improvement.

A first-class bus system that comes on-time and with such regularity that you don’t need to call the MTA for a schedule would allow the elderly to break out of their home-prison of fear and alone-ness, allow disabled residents in wheelchairs rapid and courteous service, permit high school students from the inner city to travel to good schools around the county in a reasonable amount of time, and allow working men and women to take their children to childcare, visit their sick relatives, and take the entire family to a park or beach without a care or a car.

In theory this new vision of urban transportation could cure as many ills as penicillin, jogging, and a low-fat, high-fiber diet combined—providing green jobs to produce electric buses in job-starved areas, creating new bus shelters and bus depots in blighted communities, and allowing an exhausted working class to consider going to parks, muse-ums, and free concerts miles away. Moreover, with an immediate moratorium on rail funding and either a movement or a court-imposed policy for massive funding of the bus system, the following key demands of the Billions for Buses plan would make this vision come to life.

#### Solves crashes, obesity, warming, oil dependence, land and water destruction!

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

HEALTH AND SAFETY BENEFITS¶ By removing millions of cars from American roads, public transit improves the personal health¶ and safety of all Americans. It reduces air pollution, promotes individual fitness, and prevents¶ auto crashes.¶ Nationwide, annual medical costs related to pollution caused by transportation are estimated¶ at between $40 billion and $64 billion.15 Public transportation, however, produces much less pollution¶ than driving. On a per-passenger-mile basis, transit has been found to produce 95 percent¶ less carbon monoxide (CO) than private vehicles, 90 percent fewer volatile organic compounds¶ (VOCs), and about half as much carbon dioxide (CO2) and nitrogen oxide (NOx).16¶ 5¶ Several recent studies have also documented a link between transit use, walking, and reduced¶ obesity. One widely cited study, for example, noted that transit use is associated with an additional¶ 8.3 minutes per day of walking, enough to burn between 25.7 and 39 calories. Given that¶ another study found that additional expenditure of 100 calories per day could stop the increase in¶ obesity in 90 percent of the population, the study concluded that walking associated with transit¶ could cut obesity-related medical costs by $5,500 per person.17¶ Transit use also improves public safety by reducing vehicle crashes, which are the leading cause¶ of death for Americans between the ages of five and 34. More than 40,000 Americans are killed¶ annually in car crashes,18 costing a total of $164 billion.19 The National Safety Council, however,¶ has found that riding a bus is 25 times safer than being in a car.20¶ ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY SECURITY BENEFITS¶ Finally, public transit significantly reduces greenhouse gas emissions and dependence on¶ foreign oil, both by directly reducing vehicle miles traveled as well as by supporting denser, more¶ sustainable patterns of development. This, in turn, increases the cost-effectiveness of transit,¶ resulting in a virtuous cycle. By supporting alternatives to suburban “sprawl,” transit also reduces¶ other environmental impacts, including loss of prime farmland, declining water quality, and¶ harmful emissions.¶ The transportation sector accounts for one-third of America’s carbon emissions, and as vehicle¶ miles traveled have increased, so have emissions.21 Altogether, American vehicles burn fuel at a¶ rate of 6,300 gallons per second, helping to make the U.S. the world’s leading producer of carbon¶ emissions.22 Transit, however, reduces vehicle miles traveled by 102.2 billion miles per year—¶ meaning that without transit, America’s contribution to global warming would be much greater.23¶ A 2002 study found that transit saves Americans more than 855 million gallons of gasoline a¶ year, or 45 million barrels of oil—equal to about one month’s worth of imports from Saudi Arabia¶ or three months of the fuel needed to heat, cool and supply electricity to all of the homes in¶ America.24

#### Insufficient transportation creates economic and environmental problems for minorities

Jakowitsch 2 – Director of Policy Development at the Surface Transportation Policy Project (Nancy, coordinator of the Social Equity and Livable Communities working group, 10/23/02, “TEA-3 and Environmental Justice,” Second National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit - Summit II, http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/summit2/TEA3EJ.pdf)

Environmental justice issues are woven throughout transportation reform. Hallmarks of the Civil Rights Movement such as Brown v. Board of Education, the Montgomery Bus Boycott, and opposition to Interstate construction in urban communities continue to shape the contemporary transportation justice movement. A major consequence of transportation and urban development policies during the Interstate era has been the erection of barriers to mobility for the 30 percent or more of Americans who cannot or do not drive personal vehicles. Many African-Americans, Latinos, and other racial, ethnic, disabled and age minorities in the U.S. are denied access to jobs, affordable housing, and educational and entrepreneurial opportunities located in new suburbs as a result of inadequate transit service and car ownership that is unaffordable. Systemic change is needed to ensure equitable access for communities of color, as well as children, the elderly, people with disabilities, as well as protection from transportation burdens.

Interstate highways that hollowed out thriving commercial districts in African-American neighborhoods throughout the U.S. during the 1960’s and 70’s now attract higher levels of traffic, pedestrian fatalities, and air pollution to communities of color. Bus depots are often overrepresented in these communities, while the benefits of transit service are inadequate or non-existent outside the urban core. These facilities also contribute to higher rates of asthma, respiratory illnesses and premature deaths, and like toxic landfills, deter economic development in disadvantaged communities. Highway construction that generates sprawl in outlying areas also undermines transportation investments in economically disadvantaged communities, including those facing gentrification pressures. In Montgomery, Alabama, however, the transportation challenge is no longer about discrimination on the city’s bus system but to restore and improve the fixed-route service that was completely eliminated in 1998.

### Transport Solves Health Problems/Costs

Lack of transportation infrastructure ensures health disparities

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

a. Transportation policy affects access to health care Low-income people and people of color disproportionately lose out on educational and work opportunities due to health problems. **Inadequate access to transportation has exacerbated health disparities,** **forcing many low-income patients to miss appointments**—often **worsening their medical problems**. Lack of transit options also wastes resources by forcingsome patients and providers to pay for taxis and other expensive services. 7 The high cost of transportation also forces low-income families to limit spending for other basic needs, including out-of-pocket health care expenses and nutritious food. **Access to nutritious food is a particularly important issue in rural areas**, where commerce and services arespread over large distances. It is important to addressthis now: our obesity epidemic is particularly grave inthe rural south, home to many of the so-called “fatteststates” in America. 8 For many people with disabilities, traveling by car (or transporting their children by car) is not an option, regardless of whether they can afford it. Because many individuals with disabilities have increased healthcare needs—such as physical therapy, medicationmonitoring, and other medical services—isolation fromproviders can have a profound impact on quality of life,health, and safety. **Accessible transportation options**— such as plentiful sidewalks with crosswalk modicationsfor the visually impaired, buses, and rail—**can make the difference between health care access or isolation both for adults and for the children in their care**. Isolation from health care providers has seriousconsequences for education and future opportunity: Achild who enters school with an undiagnosed vision or 3 hearing problem could fall far behind unnecessarily.Children who miss school because of illness or go toschool sick also learn less. This disadvantage carriesover to adulthood, limiting access to job opportunities. Disproportionate spending on highways designed to facilitate rapid commutes from urban work centers to distant suburbs has additional public health consequences. Without sufcient sidewalk space and bicycle-friendly streets, those in urban areas without cars are at increased risk of pedestrian accidents. Althoughthey make up about 12 percent of the U.S. population,African Americans account for 20 percent of pedestrianfatalities. 10 Research in at least one metro area has alsoshown that Latinos are also more likely to be involvedin fatal pedestrian accidents than Whites. 11 Vehicle smogdue to congestion causes asthma among urban youth.Finally, lack of investment in walkable communities hascontributed to obesity, a public health problem that hasreached epidemic proportions. Our investments to date have also affected ruralpopulations. Native Americans on reservations areamong the most affected by crumbling and inadequaterural infrastructure. They have the highest rates of pedestrian injury and death per capita of any racial or ethnic group in the United States. 12 And although fatalmotor vehicle crashes in the United States have been onthe decline, vehicle fatalities on reservations are on therise. 13

#### **Current transportation policy has detrimental effects on communities of color – shift in investment is key**

Quamie 12 (Lexer Quamie is a Counsel for the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, “Transportation Equity a Key to Winning Full Civil Rights”, Autumn Awakening, Vol. 18, <http://www.urbanhabitat.org/node/6701> EG)

Effects on Individual and Community Health Transportation policy that fails to consider the needs of low-income and minority communities can have extreme and cascading health consequences on those communities. Whether it is lack of physical access to health services and nutritious fresh food or levels of air pollution caused by traffic, our current transportation policy generates public health problems that disproportionately affect low-income communities and communities of color. A car-dependent infrastructure is a barrier to health care access and poses several health hazards—ranging from asthma to obesity. Transportation policy needs to shift a portion of the investment away from new highway construction towards expanding public transportation and building bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly roads to promote greater parity in health care access, as well as to decrease health hazards, such as pollution and pedestrian fatalities. Curbing the expansion of metropolitan areas over vast distances will also result in more compact communities where non-automobile transportation options are even more efficient and attractive.

### Transport Good---Congestion/Generic

#### Transportation infrastructure essential to life—every aspect of life is intimately tied to transportation and breaking down inequity is critical

**Goetz 2k** [Andrew R. Goetz, Department of Geography, Transportation and Social Mobility, University of Denver “TRANSPORTATION EQUITY”, <http://www.du.edu/transportation/images/pdfs/Vol_III_Sec_III.pdf>, 4/29/2000] SV

Transportation is essential to human existence. People must be able to access¶ homes, work sites, schools, shops, and other places on a daily basis. Due to the large size¶ of metropolitan areas today, complex transportation systems are necessary to facilitate¶ access to goods, services, and activities. Transportation infrastructure provides benefits to¶ people by improving accessibility and mobility, thus increasing opportunities for a better¶ quality of life.¶ As metropolitan areas have experienced rapidly expanding growth over recent¶ decades, provision of transportation infrastructure necessary to accommodate that growth¶ has not kept pace. Thus, large metropolitan areas are increasingly faced with severe¶ problems of traffic congestion and delays that rob individuals and companies of millions¶ of hours of lost time and productivity. Significant improvements in transportation can¶ reduce these economic and social costs, and alleviate some of the burdens imposed by the¶ population size and geographic extent of our metropolitan areas.¶ Because provision of transportation infrastructure confers benefits and reduces costs,¶ decisions concerning how transportation revenues and resources are distributed become¶ critical. These decisions are particularly vexing today as so many states and metropolitan¶ areas must address rapidly growing transportation needs and must also vie with each¶ other for the fixed amount of resources available for transportation infrastructure¶ provision. Adding to these pressures is the increasing realization that all individuals and¶ groups in society should be treated fairly; that there should be no discrimination on the¶ basis of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, geographic location, or other characteristics of¶ the population. Distribution of resources must address these equity concerns along with¶ the more standard problems associated with efficiency of resource use.

#### Buses solve congestion, mobility, access

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

Fundamentally, public transportation is a means to provide mobility—¶ it ensures access to jobs, schools and services for all members of¶ our society, and serves to reduce traffic congestion. But it also improves¶ the quality of our lives in ways that may be less obvious. Public¶ investment in transit is a catalyst for private investment and economic¶ growth. The more we invest in transit, the safer and healthier¶ we all become. And if we are to prevent climate change, transit will¶ have to play an essential role.¶ Following is a brief summary of some of the benefits of public transportation.¶ More information about the advantages of transit can be¶ found on the web sites of Transportation for America and the American¶ Public Transportation Association.3¶ MOBILITY BENEFITS¶ Public transportation ensures mobility for all, including the tens of millions of Americans¶ without access to a car.¶ As the nearly 80 million members of the Baby Boom generation become older and less able¶ to drive, transit will only become more essential to the basic mobility of our citizens. In addition¶ to “fixed-route” services, transit operators also provide “paratransit” services, or door-to-door van¶ services available by reservation to those unable to use conventional transit because of a disability.¶ Many transit agencies also operate in rural and suburban areas where seniors and persons with disabilities¶ must travel farther to access services, making walking impractical and taxi rides prohibitively¶ expensive. According to one study, by 2025 one in five Americans will be over the age of 65¶ –with one-fifth of those seniors unable to drive.4 Transit will, for more of us than ever before, be a¶ necessary component of individual freedom.¶ Transit also benefits owners of cars. With increases in the price of gasoline, more Americans began¶ to look in earnest for an alternative to driving their cars. In the third quarter of 2008, transit¶ ridership increased 6.5 percent over the prior year, while vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, declined¶ 4.6 percent.5 While volatile energy prices may have initially encouraged some to try transit, transit¶ ridership continued to climb even as gas prices eventually fell back down.¶ How much of an impact does transit have on congestion? According to the Texas Transportation¶ Institute’s most recent Mobility Report, in 2007 traffic delays cost residents of the 439 largest¶ urban areas in the U.S. 4.2 billion hours—but transit reduced delays by 610 million hours, or¶ 15 percent.6 The value of the additional travel delay and fuel that would have been consumed if¶ there were no public transportation service would be an additional $13.7 billion. Of course, buses¶ get stuck in traffic, too. But, since transit riders don’t have to drive, they can spend their time in¶ traffic working, reading, or just relaxing. Transit doesn’t just reduce congestion; it also offers an¶ alternative to congestion.¶

### Transport Good---Suburbanization/Poverty

#### A lack of transportation access insulates the poor from economic development and reinforces poverty

Nechyba and Walsh 4 – \*Fuchsberg-Levine Family Professor of Economics and Public Policy Studies AND \*\*Assistant Professor of Economics at the University of Colorado at Boulder (Thomas J., Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research; and Randall P., Research Associate Institute for Behavioral Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder; Fall 2004, “Urban Sprawl,” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 177-200, p. JSTOR)

Edge Cities: Multiple Centers and Further Sorting

As residential sprawling and suburbanization solidified over the course of the twentieth century, the last few decades also witnessed a growing trend toward "edge cities," with multiple employment centers located throughout many metropolitan areas. Edge cities pose difficulties for models of urban patterns based either on transportation or on sorting, and their increasing empirical importance has led to developments of alternative polycentric city models that endogenize the formation of employment centers outside the central business district (Anas, Arnott and Small, 1998; Brueckner, 1979; McDonald and McMillan, 2000; Henderson and Mitra, 1999). While some researchers have focused on patterns of dense employment subsectors at the outskirts of cities (Brueckner, 1979; Henderson and Mitra, 1999), Glaeser and Kahn (2003) suggest that edge cities typically represent relatively low-density employment areas that accompany low-density suburbanization. The formation of edge cities or decentralized employment centers raises efficiency and equity concerns that link to similar issues raised by the Tiebout literature below and must be balanced against the potential for lost agglomeration opportunities at the urban core.

In addition, edge cities may contribute to the "spatial mismatch hypothesis" first analyzed by Kain (1968), which suggests that job suburbanization has led to a disconnect in locations between jobs and low-income residential developments that are inhabited by less mobile households. In cities with little public transportation (Raphael and Stoll, 2001), this spatial mismatch may suppress employment opportunities for the poor who do not have access to the transportation technologies (cars) that drive the sprawling of cities and jobs. It remains difficult to determine whether jobs follow people or people follow jobs, although the evidence to date suggests that the former may be the case more than the latter (Steinnes, 1977; Glaeser and Kahn, 2003).

#### A lack of suburban transportation infrastructure is the root cause of the concentration of poverty in urban areas

Nechyba and Walsh 4 – \*Fuchsberg-Levine Family Professor of Economics and Public Policy Studies AND \*\*Assistant Professor of Economics at the University of Colorado at Boulder (Thomas J., Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research; and Randall P., Research Associate Institute for Behavioral Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder; Fall 2004, “Urban Sprawl,” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 177-200, p. JSTOR)

Categorical equity concerns in sprawling cities arise in part because the ability to move out of central cities and into suburbs, and the ability to choose among suburbs, is not uniform across population and income groups. Within U.S. metropolitan areas, the poor generally live in central cities while middle-income individuals live in suburbs (Margo, 1992; Mieszkowski and Mills, 1993; Mills and Lubuele, 1997; Glaeser, Kahn and Rappaport, 2000). While over 17 percent of central city residents are poor, the same is true for fewer than 7 percent of suburban residents. Public transportation has been identified as an important explanatory variable (Glaeser, Kahn and Rappaport, 2000; LeRoy and Sonstelie, 1983)—suggesting that for those using public transportation, the car-centered suburbs may simply not be an option. Furthermore, political boundaries within metropolitan areas correlate strongly with differences in poverty rates across those areas—suggesting politically created distortions through zoning, housing markets and local public finance considerations consistent with Tiebout's model (Glaeser, Kahn and Rappaport, 2000). This documented geographic separation and lower mobility of poorer households is likely to give rise to a variety of social problems in poor areas and is of independent concern to the extent to which jobs are sprawling out of cities along with residences (Mills and Lubuele, 1997; Glaeser and Kahn, 2003).

When the quality of locally provided goods is primarily a function of public investment, categorical equity concerns from Tiebout sorting can be addressed straightforwardly through provision of public resources by state or federal governments to insure the desirable level of local public provision. However, the quality of local public goods may rely less on public financing than on nonfinancial inputs that derive directly from the composition of local populations. In the case of education, for instance, family and peer externalities may play a powerful role in producing school quality (Gaviria and Raphael, 2001; Hanushek, Kain, Markman and Rivkin, 2003; Vigdor and Nechyba, 2003). It is well-known that public school quality differs across neighborhoods and districts even when observable school inputs such as per pupil spending are equalized. Per pupil spending in California has, for instance, been largely equalized with no evidence for an appreciable narrowing of school quality differences across districts. Analogously, mere spending on public safety does not lead to equal levels of protection from crime, nor does equal public investment in basic infrastructure result in uniformly functional neighborhoods. Similar insights on the potential importance of peer and family effects are emerging from the literature on local crime rates and other neighborhood characteristics (Katz, Kling and Liebman, 2001; Solon, Page and Duncan, 2000; Chase-Landsdale, Gordon, Brooks-Gunn and Klebanov, 1997). In each of these cases, the level of the public good depends critically on the characteristics of the local population that is being served by public expenditures on the good—giving rise to local peer and neighborhood externalities that shape the true levels of local public goods.

#### Distance from economic development creates residential segregation, a concentration of poverty, and cyclical problems – market forces don’t solve

Squires 2 – Professor of Sociology and Public Policy and Public Administration at George Washington University (Gregory D., member of the Board of Directors of the Woodstock Institute, the Advisory Board of the John Marshall Law School Fair Housing Legal Support Center in Chicago, Illinois and the Social Science Advisory Board of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, former research analyst for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 4/1/02, *Urban Sprawl: Causes, Consequences, & Policy Responses*, pp. 4-5, p. Google Books)

These developments feed back on each other. Households with lower incomes and the greatest economic need find housing in suburban communities, where jobs are growing fastest, increasingly difficult to afford. As jobs become more distant, it is also more difficult to participate in informal networks through which job placements are often made. This is most evident for racial minorities and particularly African Americans. As jobs and particularly those that pay a living wage become harder to find, poverty, and the concentration of poverty, increase in urban areas. Tax revenues and public services decline. As physical conditions deteriorate and resources leave the community, so-called “underclass behaviors" that are at variance with what are traditionally viewed as mainstream or middle-class norms increase. These communities become less attractive to private capital. These cycles are mutually reinforcing. Uneven economic, spatial, and social development are all interrelated pieces of the metropolitan puzzle (Jargowsky 1996; Wilson 1987, 1996; Massey and Denton 1993).

It is important to note that these developments are not inevitable, and they do not flow naturally from free market forces. Markets are real and people do make choices. However, markets operate within, and individual choices are constrained by, public policy and private sector decisionmaking. Tax policies have long favored new development in outlying communities and overseas over reinvestment in older urban facilities and communities. Demands for tax breaks from state and local governments and concessions from unions, along with the proliferation of contingent work forces, have intensified various trajectories of economic inequality. Many employers have replaced full-time workers with part- time and temporary workers, consultants, subcontractors, and other contingent workers. Two-tiered wage plans have been implemented, offering far lower wages to new entrants into the workforce than veterans performing the same tasks receive. Moreover, while the minimum wage was recently increased, corporate pressure continues to keep its value below what it was 20 years ago. Urban renewal programs destroyed many city neighborhoods in favor of downtown business development. Federally subsidized highways and mortgage loans fueled suburban development and expedited inner city decline. Exclusionary zoning laws by most suburban municipalities, racial steering by real estate agents, and redlining by financial institutions created and continue to reinforce segregated housing patterns (Orfield 1997; Holland 1986; Goldsmith and Blakely 1992; Jackson 1985; Rusk 1999; Squires 1994; Harrison and Bluestone 1988; Marshall 2000; Luria and Rogers 1999).

This confluence of intersecting forces of uneven development has framed the evolution of urban and metropolitan communities in recent decades. It is also the context within which prevailing debates over urban and suburban sprawl have emerged.

#### Policy decisions must focus on reducing urban inequality to avoid broader inequalities.

Kim, 2k8 (Sukkoo, Associate Professor, Department of Economics UCLA, Economic History; Urban and Regional Economics; Trade and Development ,“Spatial Inequality and Economic Development: Theories, Facts and Policies” https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:wm0xC4ZyVu8J:www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/kim\_final\_draft.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjEtZgJt4maAQXU7At0qH\_d6skw73SUk1JBRHjSLLFc1EQzvvJUahEmJkZaTfibs8Qq8BW4R346hQGNxlBWVmtBQ79ZOVylFk112mCYbC1ElO1EEmb5ugvpWMA-ZukxiWqkyGi2&sig=AHIEtbTf2vSCCjxg9M1XO5gWyBYFu19gJA&pli=1, March 2008)

For policy makers, it is critical to understand that urban inequality and regional inequality are highly interdependent. Even though most models of urban inequality do not address the issue of regional inequality, urban inequality affects regional inequality in a variety of ways. First, the well-known urban-rural wage gap will lead to regional inequality if there are regional differences in the rates of urbanization. Thus, an increase in the urban-rural wage gap may contribute to a growing regional inequality. Second, urban specialization in different industries may contribute to regional inequality if regions possess different types of cities. Third, the size distribution of cities will undoubtedly influence regional inequality. If cities are uniformly small, then urbanization is likely to have limited impact on regional inequality. However, if cities differ in size as they usually do, then urban inequality may have a major impact on regional inequality. For example, urban primacy or the concentration of a significant share of the urban population in few central cities will no doubt cause regional inequality. Thus, policies which reduce the importance of urban primacy are likely to contribute to greater regional equality.

#### Transportation Infrastructure Investments contribute to the reduction of spatial inequality.

Kim, 2k8 (Sukkoo, Associate Professor, Department of Economics UCLA, Economic History; Urban and Regional Economics; Trade and Development ,“Spatial Inequality and Economic Development: Theories, Facts and Policies” https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:wm0xC4ZyVu8J:www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/kim\_final\_draft.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjEtZgJt4maAQXU7At0qH\_d6skw73SUk1JBRHjSLLFc1EQzvvJUahEmJkZaTfibs8Qq8BW4R346hQGNxlBWVmtBQ79ZOVylFk112mCYbC1ElO1EEmb5ugvpWMA-ZukxiWqkyGi2&sig=AHIEtbTf2vSCCjxg9M1XO5gWyBYFu19gJA&pli=1, March 2008)

Fifth, there seems to be some evidence that transportation and communications infrastructural investments are associated with a decline in spatial inequality. Several studies suggest that inter-regional infrastructure investments may contribute to the reduction of urban concentration (Henderson et. al (2001). Gallup et. al (1999) point to the importance of the historical investments in national navigable waterways, Rosen and Resnick (1978) to rail investments, and Henderson (2002) to the national road and highway investments. Baum-Snow (2007) shows that the introduction of interstate highways in the United States reduced central city population growth by at least 8% between 1950 and 1990.

#### Current urban development has led to an increase in the concentration of poverty

Downs 99 – senior fellow in the Economic Studies program at the Brookings Institution (Anthony, August 1999, “SOME REALITIES ABOUT SPRAWL AND URBAN DECLINE,” Brookings Institute, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/1999/8/cities%20downs/199908.pdf)

The second set of problems connected with metropolitan growth occurs mainly in big cities, innerring suburbs, and a few outer-ring suburbs. These problems arise because our develop ment process concentrates poor households – especially poor minority households – in certain high-poverty neighborhoods. Those neighborhoods become sites for high crime rates, poor quality public schools, dysfunctional big-city bureaucracies, and low fiscal resources. These poverty-related problems soon spread to inner-ring suburbs too. And many outer-ring suburbs with low commercial tax bases but a lot of low-cost housing have inadequate taxable resources to pay for decent schools and other services.

The first set of growth-related problems has received the most attention during the current national discussion of sprawl, because it directly affects a majority of metropolitan residents – who are also the wealthiest and most influential such residents. The second set of problems related to concentrated poverty has received much less attention, even though I believe it is far more important to the nation’s long-run welfare. It is less well publicized because it directly affects a much smaller group of people, who are also among the poorest and least influential residents of our society. Yet the degree to which concentrated poverty reduces the ability of these citizens to acquire the skills and incomes need to live well in, and contribute fruitfully to, a high-technology society will have immense impacts on the social, political, and economic welfare of the entire nation.

#### The impoverished rely on public transportation for living necessities

Sanchez and Brenman 7 – \*Director and Associate Professor in the Urban Affairs and Planning Program at Virginia Tech’s Alexandria Center AND \*\*Executive Director of the Washington State Human Rights Commission (Thomas W., Ph.D. in city planning from Georgia Tech, research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech; and Marc, former Executive Director of the Washington State Human Rights Commission and former Senior Policy Advisor for Civil Rights at the US Department of Transportation; 3/29-3/31/07, “TRANSPORTATION EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: LESSONS FROM HURRICANE KATRINA,” presented at The State of Environmental Justice in America 2007 Conference at the Howard University School of Law, http://www.ejconference.net/images/Sanchez\_Brenman.pdf)

Transportation plays a vital role in our society. In fact, the Supreme Court recognized that the right to travel is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.1 Given the important role of transportation, it is quite understandable that transportation policy can be contentious. Too often, however, fights over what specific projects will be funded and in which states or congressional districts, and scant attention is paid to the larger social and economic effects that transportation policies have.

Americans have become increasingly mobile and more reliant on automobiles to meet their travel needs, due largely to transportation policies adopted after World War II that emphasized highway development over public transportation. According to Census 2000 data, less than 5 percent of trips to work in urban areas were made by public transit; however, this varies significantly by race and location.2 Minorities, however, are less likely to own cars than whites and are more often dependent on public transportation. The “transit-dependent” must often rely on public transportation not only to travel to work but also to get to school, obtain medical care, attend religious services, and shop for basic necessities such as groceries. The transit-dependent are often people with low incomes, and thus, in addition to facing more difficulties getting around, they face economic inequities as a result of transportation policies oriented toward travel by car.

Surface transportation policies at the local, regional, state, and national levels have a direct impact on urban land use and development patterns. The types of transportation facilities and services in which public funds are invested provide varying levels of access to meet basic social and economic needs. The way communities develop land dictates the need for certain types of transportation, and, on the other hand, the transportation options in which communities invest influence patterns of urban development. In an examination of the evacuation failures during Hurricane Katrina and Rita, Litman suggests that many of these failures can be attributed to a lack of resilience, or ability to absorb unexpected circumstances through redundancy within the transportation system. Litman notes that the tragedies of Katrina are “simply extreme examples of the day-to-day problems facing non-drivers due to inadequate and poorly integrated transportation services.”3 He suggests, therefore, that many of these failures can be attributed to a lack of resilience, or ability to absorb unexpected circumstances through redundancy, within the city’s transportation system.4

#### **Increasing public transportation access solves residential segregation**

Herbst 8 (Chris M., Assistant Professor at the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University, Ph.D., Public Policy, University of Maryland, M.P.P., Public Policy, The Johns Hopkins University, M.S., Social Work/Policy, Columbia University, B.A., Psychology, Fairfield University, F Fulbright Fellow: Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies, “Public policy and residential segregation: a critique of Iris Young's strategy of differentiated solidarity,” http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Public+policy+and+residential+segregation%3A+a+critique+of+Iris+Young's...-a0188159168)

A final policy approach to decrease residential segregation involves increasing access to public transportation. For inner-city residents who use public transportation to work in suburban areas, accessibility represents real costs in terms of travel time and other expenditures. Therefore, residents in segregated communities with less spatial accessibility to jobs and transportation face higher work-related costs and thus greater constraints on employment. Furthermore, commuting times by public modes are considerably longer than by private modes, suggesting that wages net of travel time are significantly reduced if workers in segregated urban areas must travel to jobs in suburbs. Such costs have been quantified by transportation experts, who define as "accessible" those distances less than a quarter mile from a public transit stop. Using this definition, a study of four metropolitan areas found that 65 to 70 percent of all low-skilled jobs are located in white suburbs, and that nearly half of these jobs are inaccessible. On the other hand, just one-quarter of low-skilled jobs are located in the central city, with 86 percent accessible by public transportation. These findings suggest that policy interventions aimed at making low-skilled jobs physically accessible to central city residents are likely to have a positive effect on employment and earnings. Two general approaches have been cited to increase job accessibility in segregated neighborhoods. The first is to increase access to suburban housing. However, housing mobility programs, such as MTO, are costly and limited in scale. The second approach involves subsidizing commutes by providing van pools to suburbs or improving public transportation's connectivity between the central city and suburbs. A major drawback of this approach is that it does not attempt induce relocation. An example of this policy is HUD's Bridges to Work initiative, which conducts job placements and transportation assistance to suburban jobs. While these programs are less costly per participant and less politically controversial than voucher programs, they do not address fully the deleterious effects of living in segregated areas with concentrated poverty.

### Transport Good---Disaster Evac

#### A lack of transportation for the poor made evacuation planning in the wake of Hurricane Katrina impossible

Sanchez and Brenman 7 – \*Director and Associate Professor in the Urban Affairs and Planning Program at Virginia Tech’s Alexandria Center AND \*\*Executive Director of the Washington State Human Rights Commission (Thomas W., Ph.D. in city planning from Georgia Tech, research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech; and Marc, former Executive Director of the Washington State Human Rights Commission and former Senior Policy Advisor for Civil Rights at the US Department of Transportation; 3/29-3/31/07, “TRANSPORTATION EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: LESSONS FROM HURRICANE KATRINA,” presented at The State of Environmental Justice in America 2007 Conference at the Howard University School of Law, http://www.ejconference.net/images/Sanchez\_Brenman.pdf)

Recent events, including the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the devastating hurricanes in the Gulf Coast region during 2005, have highlighted the importance of planning and, in the case of Hurricane Katrina, the importance of transportation mobility in response to such events. Anticipating terrorist-related attacks involves significant planning around safety and security throughout national, regional, and local transportation systems. Particularly susceptible are public transportation facilities where large numbers of people are concentrated either in stations or on transit vehicles. There are a number of lessons that have become apparent following Hurricane Katrina.

The case of New Orleans and Hurricane Katrina represents the chronic neglect of warnings about inevitable disaster and, in this case, the lack of attention devoted to clearly foreseen risks and the planning to deal with them. Particular examples include the lack of foresight in evacuation planning for people in New Orleans who did not own cars or who could not afford gas. One could argue that this was a completely unique set of circumstances; however, some South Florida cities that have extensive experience with disasters ranging from fire to hurricanes actually monitor car ownership statistics and have emergency plans that feature sending public transportation to neighborhoods with low car ownership rates.6 The information from public transportation route planning (which often takes into account mobility levels) could be easily used to identify the locations of residents likely to need assistance during evacuations. Related to these planning efforts should be the coordination and use of existing infrastructure, such as fleets of school buses. This would result in the consequent need for legal liability safe harbors that are common barriers to interagency sharing of resources.

### Solvency/Responsibility Impact/D-bils Solvency

**Squo transportation is based off of exclusion---transportation denies millions of differently abled and people of color access to opportunities**

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

Our civil rights laws bar employers, federal, state, andlocal governments, and public accommodations fromdiscriminating in access to health care, employmentopportunities, housing, education, and voting. Althoughour laws promise to open doors to opportunity, this is ahollow promise for people who are physically isolatedfrom jobs, schools, stores that sell healthy food, andhealth care providers. As our metropolitan areas haveexpanded and jobs and services have become morediffuse, equal **opportunity depends upon equal access to affordable transportation**.Transportation investment to date has produced **an inhospitable landscape** for low-income people, peoplewith disabilities, seniors, and many people in rural areas. **People of color are disproportionately disadvantagedby the current state of transportation.** The cost of car ownership, underinvestment in public transportation, and a paucity of pedestrian and bicycle-accessible thoroughfares have isolated urban and low-incomepeople from jobs and services. Because many peoplewith disabilities do not have the option to drivecars, lack of access to other modes of transportationdisproportionately harms them. Similarly, seniors andpeople in rural areas often have limited transportationchoices.This is the civil rights dilemma: Our laws purport tolevel the playing eld, but **our transportation choices have effectively barred millions of people from accessing it. Traditional nondiscrimination protections cannot protect people for whom opportunities are literally out of reach.**

#### We have a responsibility to provide equal access to transportation---the alternative is the disabled being locked out of society

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

New riders have come from a variety of sources. Volatile gas prices have driven many car¶ commuters to switch to transit, but even more riders have been lured by the provision of new¶ services: Commuter trains and buses, new light rail lines, and even the return of streetcars in¶ several cities. Homes and jobs have clustered around new and existing lines, making it easier to¶ live and work near transit. Newer riders choose public transportation for many reasons: To save¶ money on car ownership or have a more reliable commute, to act on their environmental values,¶ and to relax or be productive during their commutes.¶ Of course, a substantial number of riders use¶ transit because the alternative is to be stranded.¶ These are older Americans whose eyesight, reflexes,¶ or budgets no longer permit them to drive cars. They¶ are young adolescents getting to school or their first¶ jobs. And they are low-income families, disproportionately¶ African-American and Hispanic, who cannot¶ afford to own and operate one or more cars.¶ Ensuring mobility for these Americans is important¶ to all of us. Among our nation’s core values¶ is the promise that everyone should have access to¶ opportunity and jobs, to be able to support themselves¶ and be contributing members of the community. We believe everyone, including our older¶ citizens and those with disabilities, should be able to live full and productive lives whether or not¶ they are able to drive a car.¶ Naturally, fare increases and service cuts will have the greatest impact on people who have few¶ other options for travel to work, school, and health services.¶ The majority of transit passengers remain, on average, somewhat poorer than other Americans.¶ One in five have incomes below $15,000, and nearly two-thirds earn less than $50,000.¶ About one-third do not own a car, and more than half take a bus or train because a car is not¶ available for the trip.25 Minorities and recent immigrants in particular depend on affordable and¶ reliable transit services to reach everyday destinations, such as jobs, education and health care.¶ African-Americans and Hispanics comprise a majority of the country’s transit users, including¶ 62 percent of bus and light rail riders, 35 percent of subway and¶ heavy rail riders, and 29 percent of commuter rail riders.26¶ These riders may be more significantly affected by changes in¶ services than other groups because they have fewer transportation¶ options available for their daily mobility. African-Americans¶ are almost six times as likely as whites to take their trips by¶ transit (5.3 percent vs. 0.9 percent) and Hispanics about three¶ times more than whites (2.4 percent vs. 0.9 percent).27¶ All Occupied Units 8.5%¶ Below Poverty Level 26.6%¶ African-American 20.2%¶ 65 or older 15.6%¶ Hispanic 11.9%¶ Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and¶ U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, American¶ Housing Survey for the United States, H150 (via U.S. Bureau of¶ Transportation Statistics, Transportation Statistics Annual Report,¶ 2006).¶ FIGURE 1 PERCENTAGES OF HOUSEHOLDS¶ WITHOUT A VEHICLE (2005)¶ WHO IS AFFECTED BY¶ TRANSIT CUTS?¶ 7¶ Low-income riders are particularly vulnerable to increases in a basic, single-ride fare, as they¶ disproportionately pay these fares rather than invest in the monthly passes typically used by everyday¶ commuters. For these riders, an increase in a transit¶ provider’s “cash fare” from, say, $1.50 to $2 per ride can¶ quickly add up.¶ Riders that depend on transit as their only means of¶ transportation are also vulnerable to service cuts because¶ they are likely to rely on “lifeline” services that are often¶ less cost-effective for transit operators to provide, but¶ ensure basic mobility connecting low-income communities¶ to jobs, to schools, and to social services. Lifeline services¶ are bus routes, which generally have higher labor costs¶ than rail lines. These routes also operate at “off-peak” times¶ throughout the day, in the evening and on weekends, when¶ ridership is more spread out. When transit agencies look to¶ make cuts, they often try to affect the fewest riders. While¶ this makes sense from one perspective, it also tends to be¶ transit-dependent riders who are hurt the most by service¶ cuts.¶ Eliminating lifeline services doesn’t just impact riders of those routes. Because paratransit¶ service—vans for those unable to use regular fixed-route transit—must legally be provided in the¶ same general area as fixed routes whenever those routes are in operation, cutting a fixed route¶ either in full or in part (during certain times of day) can mean eliminating the only mobility option¶ for many seniors and persons with disabilities.

### Solvency---Coop W/ States / P3'S

#### Cooperation with the states and P3's are vital

CUTR 7 (Center for Urban Transportation Research University of South Florida, (written for USDOT) preparing a report for a US-Russia joint transportation symposium, “Developing Effective Mass Transit Systems”, September 2007, http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/MoscowConferenceProceedings\_English\_Version.pdf)

Both the Russian and US presentations highlighted the fact that similar problems are¶ currently being experienced in both countries. Dramatic economic expansion in the closing years 20th century has resulted in exponential increases in levels of private vehicle ownership. This has placed great pressure to increase the capacity of existing¶ transportation infrastructure, typically through increasing existing highway capacity, and¶ building new highways, and providing enhanced public transit service. However, there are extremely high costs associated with this type of large scale infrastructure provision,¶ both in financial terms, as well as in terms of social costs and environment impacts. The¶ governments of both countries are aware that the funds required to provide such¶ infrastructure is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain through traditional sources.¶ Both countries also acknowledge the important role that public transit has to play in¶ addressing future transportation system challenges. In both countries, transit services¶ depend heavily on the federal government, both for planning and building new services,¶ and for funding existing ones. The process leading to provision of new services is time consuming and often hindered by lack if co-ordination between local and federal government. A more streamlined evaluation and implementation process is required so¶ that projects may be completed within reasonable timescales. This will require closer¶ collaboration between local and federal government through the identification of¶ common goals. Funding constraints have also led the U.S federal government to¶ investigate the implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as a low-cost rapid transit¶ alternative to Light Rail. One of the most successful BRT projects in the U.S is the Metro¶ Orange Line in Los Angeles, which, since its opening in 2005 has already exceeded 2020¶ ridership projections and has resulted in a marked reduction in traffic congestion on¶ parallel highways.¶ The issues outlined above have stimulated increased interest in Public Private¶ Partnerships (also known as PPP or P3), as a way of leveraging private sector technical,¶ management, and financial resources. Mr Ford of SFMTA discussed the multitude of¶ different PPP models that are available, and explained which ones had been successfully¶ employed in the US to provide transportation infrastructure and to develop real-estate¶ through joint development arrangements. Mr Ford’s discussion showed how PPP¶ arrangements compare favorably to more traditional approaches in terms of delivering¶ projects within challenging time and budget constraints, while reducing the financial and¶ legal risk to the responsible public sector agency.¶ While the PPP approach to providing public transit infrastructure is in its infancy in the¶ Russian Federation, this country has extensive experience in involving the private sector¶ in transit service provision, with a multitude of private companies responsible for the¶ provision of bus, tram, and trolleybus services in Moscow and other Russian cities. One¶ innovative aspect of this approach is the separation of transit services into Commercial¶ Routes and Social Routes. Demand is high enough on the Commercial Routes to allow¶ the private companies to set their own fare levels and concession structures, and to yield a¶ profit without any government subsidy. Social Routes are provided where demand is not¶ high enough to allow a profitable service to be operated. In this case the government¶ provides a subsidy to the private company to operate the service, specifying the fare level¶ and concession structure. In this way, areas of lower passenger demand are still provided¶ with sufficient access to the transit system.¶ Overall it is clear that both countries share similar problems in terms of transit service¶ planning and congestion mitigation. In both cases it seems that the federal government¶ needs to develop a closer relationship with the local governments and that increased¶ private sector involvement may be part of the solution. In this respect, the Russian¶ delegates benefited from hearing how the PPP approach may be applied to transit¶ infrastructure provision and joint development, while the U.S delegates were able to learn¶ the innovative ways in which private companies are utilized in transit operations in¶ Russian cities.

#### PPP key

CUTR 7 (Center for Urban Transportation Research University of South Florida, (written for USDOT) preparing a report for a US-Russia joint transportation symposium, “Developing Effective Mass Transit Systems”, September 2007, http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/MoscowConferenceProceedings\_English\_Version.pdf)

P³ enable public agencies to tap private sector technical, management and financial resources in¶ new ways to achieve certain public agency objectives such as greater cost and schedule certainty,¶ supplementing in-house staff, innovative technology applications, specialized expertise or access¶ to private capital. The private partner can expand its business opportunities in return for¶ assuming the new or expanded responsibilities and risks.¶ The success of public-private ventures in other sectors (utilities, telecommunications, public¶ highway transportation) have pushed public transportation agencies to re-think public private¶ partnership models as the growth in traditional transportation revenue sources (gasoline taxes¶ and transit fares) continues to decline while transportation operation, maintenance, replacement¶ and expansion needs and costs increase. Thus, transportation agencies face significant pressure to¶ reduce costs and find new sources of revenue. (Source: Federal Register, Vol. 72 No. 12).

### Solvency---Plan Breaks Down Automobility

Only a shift away towards public transportation can dissemble the discourse of automobility

Henderson 06 (Jason Henderson works at the Department of Geography and Human Environmental Studies at the San Francisco State University. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Volume 30.2 June 2006 293–307. “Secessionist Automobility: Racism, Anti-Urbanism, and the Politics of Automobility in Atlanta, Georgia”.)

This idea of a love affair arises in part from the claim that the automobile is a logical¶ expression of values like individualism, freedom and democracy (Dunn, 1998). But this¶ contradicts the reality that automobility derives from a system calculated to coerce¶ individuals into driving, that subordinates all other modes of transport and ways of¶ dwelling, that requires enormous state subsidy and regimentation of urban space for¶ maximum throughput and speed, and requires a centralized state-backed capitalist¶ oligopoly of oil, highway, automotive manufacturing and real estate control over¶ transportation policy (Freund and Martin, 1993; Urry, 2004).¶ In the US, think-tanks with signiﬁcant inﬂuence on public policy ignore this¶ hegemonic and coercive power of automobility and instead insist that Americans¶ individually love their cars and will not ride transit or live in compact, walkable cities¶ (Gordon and Richardson, 1997; O’Toole, 2001). The inevitability hypothesis is reduced¶ to one of consumer choice. Furthermore, Dunn (1998) argues that an ‘anti-auto¶ vanguard’ of academic elites, environmentalists and urban advocates are delusional¶ because they think they can actually roll back the inﬂuence of cars over cities.¶ Such rhetoric has had a chilling effect on the direction of policymaking about urban¶ space, has severely limited what is considered practical and possible, and thwarts serious¶ efforts to create an ecologically sound and socially just urban future — both in the US¶ and globally. Most of all, this essentialization is overly simplistic and deeply misguided.¶ So what undergirds the supposed universal love affair with automobility?¶ By probing deeper into the discourse and motivations of stakeholders in debates over¶ automobility and urban growth, the idea of a hegemonic car culture can be disassembled.¶ Let us begin by thinking about how mobility is not just movement but also an extension¶ of ideologies and normative values about how the city should be conﬁgured and by¶ whom. That is, just as Lefebvre (1991) theorized that the character and nature of¶ produced space reﬂects the dominant modes of production and social relations within a¶ given society, we must give consideration to how certain forms of mobility contain¶ embedded social relations. For example, Sheller and Urry (2000) refer to automobility¶ as the dominant culture that sustains discourses about what constitutes the good life.¶ Miller (2001) explains automobility as mediating contemporary human relations and as¶ a material expression of cultural life. Automobiles are not just a way of moving, they¶ objectify personal and social values. Indeed Lefebvre remarked that automobility was¶ the epitome of objects and was falsely inculcated into individuals by consumer¶ capitalism (quoted in Inglis, 2004: 204). Moreover, just as Purcell (2001) argues that¶ the ‘suburban idea’ is a spatial vision in places like Los Angeles, embodying a set of¶ distinct social values, automobility and its spaces contain a package of social values that¶ can be thought of as a ‘mobility vision’.

#### Creating mass transit discourages the ideology of automobility

Henderson 06 (Jason Henderson works at the Department of Geography and Human Environmental Studies at the San Francisco State University. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Volume 30.2 June 2006 293–307. “Secessionist Automobility: Racism, Anti-Urbanism, and the Politics of Automobility in Atlanta, Georgia”.)

Over the last 50 years there have been numerous economic, environmental and social critiques of automobility, or the combined impact on the built environment of the motor vehicle (cars, trucks), the automobile industry, the highway and street networks, and corollary services, plus the centering of society and everyday life around the car and its spaces (Freund and Martin, 1993; Newman and Kenworthy, 1999). These critiques have asserted, like Sheller and Urry (2000), that the automobile is more than just a status symbol or a neutral technology that permits patterns of life that would happen anyway; it has configured modern urban life through distinctive ways of dwelling, production, consumption, circulation and sociality to such an extent that civil society in the US, Western Europe, and increasingly global cities, are societies of automobility. What is more, detractors argue that any reasonable transformation of cities based on ecological sustainability and social justice will surely require political contestation of automobility (Freund and Martin, 1993; Sheller and Urry, 2000). Such political contestation of automobility is unfolding in the US, Europe and globally. Scholars, activists and policymakers advocate curtailing automobility by reconfiguring urban space into denser, transit-oriented and walkable built forms — a development pattern broadly labeled ‘smart growth’ or ‘new urbanism’ in the US, or ‘compact cities’ in Europe. This contestation of automobility is about reclaiming urban spaces from automobiles, limiting their use, and more broadly, changing cultures so that the whole concept of high speed mobility and car ownership is de-emphasized (Whitelegg, 1993; Sheller and Urry, 2000).

#### Public Transit solves best

**Litman & Brenman 12** [Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, Marc Brenman, Social Justice Consultancy and Senior Policy Advisor to The City Project, “A New Social Equity Agenda For Sustainable Transportation”, <http://www.vtpi.org/equityagenda.pdf>, 8 March 2012] SV

There are many reasons to improve alternative modes. For example, high quality public transit¶ (comfortable vehicles and station, frequent and fast service, good user information and¶ supportive land use policies) tends to reduce traffic congestion, road and parking facility costs, ¶ consumer costs, accidents, energy consumption, pollution emissions, as well as improving ¶ mobility options for non-drivers and public fitness and health. High quality public transit can be ¶ a catalyst for more multi-modal community development and helps make transit more socially ¶ acceptable. As a result, rational planning and funding (called “least-cost planning”) could ¶ significantly increase support for transit in transport planning and funding (VTPI 2010).

### Solvency---Short Term Policies Good

#### A complete revitalization of urban transportation accessibility allows for long-term policies

Swanstorm 9 (Todd, E. Desmond Lee Professor of Community Collaboration and Public Policy Administration, University of Missouri, St. Louis, “Breaking Down Silos: Transportation, Economic Development, and Health,” Healthy, Equitable Transportation Policy, 9/24/09, http://www.convergencepartnership.org/atf/cf/%7B245A9B44-6DED-4ABD-A392-AE583809E350%7D/6\_HealthyTrans\_book\_BreakingSilos.pdf)

Unfortunately, most people today live in a ¶ built environment that requires extensive use ¶ of cars or buses. To devote the vast bulk of ¶ our resources to public transportation in order ¶ to shape the built environment in a more ¶ progressive direction would be shortsighted.¶ 53¶ We must continue to invest resources in ¶ maintaining and improving bus service for lowincome persons and people with disabilities ¶ (including making buses less polluting), even ¶ though buses, unlike light-rail systems, do not ¶ create powerful incentives for higher-density ¶ TOD. Indeed, we may need to subsidize vans ¶ and even car ownership for some people who ¶ live in areas not serviced by mass transit.¶ 54¶ Ultimately, we need short-term policies to ¶ accommodate the transportation needs of ¶ people where they presently live at the same ¶ time that we advocate for long-term policies ¶ that will shape living patterns to reduce ¶ automobile dependence and create healthier ¶ environments for everyone.

### Poverty Impact---Enviro Harms

#### Environmental impacts disproportionally impacts the poor

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

4.20 Transport externalities (such as vehicle emissions, congestion, and the risk of traffic accidents) are other causes of market failure. The impact of these types of market failure on various income groups in general, and the poor in particular, is unclear and is not well documented. If the rich and the poor face the similar degree of health and accident risk, the poor are victims to a greater degree than the rich because motor vehicle users are mostly among the rich. In fact, there are many situations where the poor face higher risks than the rich. The poor tend to live closer to traffic on arterial roads and therefore are exposed to traffic pollution more intensively and frequently. In many large cities, the poor tend to suffer more from mixed traffic on the streets. Because they tend to use more vulnerable modes including walking, they are more likely to be the victims of traffic accidents. Accident risk in mixed traffic corridors is higher for non-motorized transport users than motorized transport users.36

#### The urban poor are more exposed to environmental problems

Schweitzer and Valenzuela 4 – \*Ph.D. candidate in urban planning at UCLA AND \*\*director of the Center for the Study of Urban Poverty (Lisa; and Abel, Jr., associate professor of urban planning and Chicano/a studies at UCLA, ; May 2004, “Environmental Injustice and Transportation: The Claims and the Evidence,” *Journal of Planning Literature*, Volume 18, Number 4, pp. 383-398, p. Sage)

AIR POLLUTION

Vehicles (including marine vessels and airplanes) are a major source of air pollution in metropolitan regions, including

• carbon monoxide, a colorless gas that reacts with hemoglobin in the blood and restricts oxygen intake;

• sulfur dioxide (SO2), which can react to form sulfuric acid that aggravates respiratory problems;

• nitrogen oxides (NOx) and hydrocarbons (HC), which are precursors to ozone (O3) and peroxyacetylnitrates (PAN). Ozone and PAN have been associated with respiratory and eye irritations, as well as cancer;

• particulate matter (PM) and aerosols, which cause or aggravate bronchio-pulmonar and respiratory illnesses such as asthma; and

• air toxics or hazardous air pollutants (HAPS) that are known or suspected carcinogens, including benzene.

Some of the first distributional analyses evaluate air quality (Bowen 2001). For example, Asch and Seneca (1978) use multivariate analysis to correlate particulate levels in 284 cities in 23 states. When they conduct the analysis at the city level, they find a significant relationship between particulate levels and income. Because these results were suggestive, they conduct a similar modeling exercise at the tract level for particulates, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide in three large midwestern cities: Chicago, Cleveland, and Nashville. They find a consistent, inverse relationship between air pollution and income. They find significant relationships between minority populations for particulates and sulfur dioxide in Chicago, but the signs for the coefficients in the Cleveland model are counter to expectation for particulates and nitrogen dioxide. This study foreshadows an enduring theme in the environmental justice research: different findings with regard to race and income in different regions.

Emissions-Exposure Analyses

Asch and Seneca (1978) typify one type of distributional analysis in which emissions levels are correlated with the presence of low-income and minority residents. This approach is common in analyses fromgeography, planning, and economics. In one such study, Liu (1996) investigates the distribution of urban ozone plumes in New York and Philadelphia. He argues that pollution should affect housing prices, so that those who have low incomes should be found in greater concentrations in the ozone footprint. Instead, he finds that ozone plumes in these cities were inhabited predominately by those living in high-rent urban housing. He suggests individuals may be unaware of the risks associated with the plumes, so that the risks will not necessarily be captured in housing markets. Korc (1996), however, uses a simulation model (REHEX II) of the time spent in different pollution micro-environments (e.g., home, work, outside, in vehicle) and the subsequent exposure to ozone among residents in the south coast air basin (Los Angeles and San Diego). He finds that people of color and lower income groups had higher exposures to ozone, but that the disparity in exposure between whites and persons of color diminished from 1980 to 1990. The author concludes, however, that low-income groups experienced higher levels of ozone during both time periods.

Brainard et al. (2002) analyze carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide (two major tailpipe emissions) in Birmingham, England. These authors simulated risk from CO and NO2, and then mapped the risk levels in a GIS with map layers for age, ethnicity, and poverty for enumeration districts across the city. Their descriptive analysis of mean exposure shows that white residents in Birmingham lived in areas with 35 percent to 40 percent lower carbon monoxide and roughly 22 percent lower nitrogen dioxide emissions than enumeration districts more heavily populated by racial and ethnic minorities. They use Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to determine significant differences in the risk distribution between white, Indian, Pakistani, black, and Bangladeshi groups. They find that deprivation indices (and other proxies for class, including home and car ownership) correlate closely with ethnicity in the poorest 25 percent of the enumeration districts. The authors use a nonparametric ridge regression technique designed to compensate for colinearity between variables such as ethnicity and poverty. In their regression, the ethnicity and deprivation variables are significant and had the expected signs. Emissions rose with increased concentrations of Bangladeshi and black residents, as well as with deprivation.With this study, Brainard et al. (2002) demonstrated that poverty and ethnicity exert distinct, yet interactive, effects in models of pollution distribution.

In a national study in England, Mitchell and Dorling (2003) studied the distribution of NOx among socioeconomic groups. First, the authors run emissions models to estimate the emissions each community (ward) generates. Emissions models estimate the amount of pollution generated as a function of traffic volumes, engine technology, and operating characteristics. In this study, the authors use auto ownership levels as a proxy measure for traffic volume generated in a ward.

From the emissions models, the authors employ a dispersion-box model, which uses the emissions estimates, background concentrations, and empirical measurements to derive a concentration level. These concentrations are assigned to ward centroids and matched with the ward’s socioeconomic characteristics. Their results show that the most impoverished wards in England suffer the highest concentrations of NO2, but as a group are responsible for producing only a small amount. These findings challenge the belief that because low-income persons own older, less-tuned— and therefore higher emitting—vehicles, they may be responsible for much of the pollution in their own neighborhoods. Rather, Mitchell and Dorling find that low-income communities may emit more pollution per driver, but that more affluent residents create far more emissions because of their much higher levels of auto ownership and use.NO2 emissions are shifted fromrich to poor. In keeping with Liu (1996), Mitchell and Dorling (2003) found that densely populated residential areas demonstrated higherNO2, even in more affluent neighborhoods. Their findings, however, hinge on the accuracy of the assumptions about auto ownership used in the emissions models.

McCleod et al. (2000), in another nationwide study in England, produce similar findings as Mitchell and Dorling. These researchers use measured NOx, PM10, and SO2 levels for England and Wales from the United Kingdom’s Automated Urban Monitoring Network and Automatic Rural Monitoring Network. They conduct a multilevel analysis of 401 districts nested within 10 regional administrative districts.With the logarithm of pollution measurements as the dependent variable, greater variation occurs among regions than among districts. Because of the unexplained variation at the regional level, the authors conclude that disparities in air quality among socioeconomics groups differ from region to region.

Their random coefficients models confirm this conclusion.

For these models, McCleod et al. (2000) used a social class index, population density, and percentage minority as explanatory variables. Significant associations were apparent between pollution, ethnicity, and social class. The multilevel approach reveals intriguing differences among regions and among pollutants.With PM10, they find steeper slopes between pollution and social class in regions with high mean pollution levels. This means that the disparity within the nested districts is greater than in regions with lower mean levels, so that where pollution is the worst, it is also less equitably distributed. This is not the case for SO2, where greater means are associated with lower disparities in distribution. McCleod et al. (2000) surmise that the interregional differences in air quality distribution stems from differences in regional pollution sources, such as transport in England’s urban regions versus coal consumption in Wales. But they unfortunately do not include these types of variables in their models.

Another mapping study examined the socioeconomic distribution of total suspended particulates (TSP). Jerrett et al. (2001) used data gathered from 23 monitoring stations in Hamilton, Canada. They employed universal kriging, a geostatistical method designed to estimate a continuous surface of values from point measurements. They constructed surfaces for both yearly geometric means of TSP and the probability of extreme pollution events. These values become the dependent variable in ordinary least squares and spatial autoregressive (SAR) models. For explanatory variables, Jerrett et al. selected income, dwelling value, unemployment rate, educational attainment, and immigrant population. They showed that income and dwelling value proved strong predictors of TSP levels. The authors argued that their findings are sensitive to model specification; in the SAR model, the association between pollution and socioeconomic variables proved to be less strongly correlated with pollution. The spatial dependence found and corrected for in the SAR model, however, may have resulted fromtheir use of kriging— a spatial interpolation method—to estimate their TSP values. This leaves unresolved whether the spatial dependence they detected in their residuals describes the distribution of pollution in the city, or reflects a spatial dependence imposed during kriging.

Health Studies

The second major type of air-quality analysis in environmental justice comes from public health. These studies tend to model health consequences as a function of emissions or traffic density. The health effects studied range from child health issues, including respiratory ailments, elevated blood-lead levels, cancer, and preterm birth to cardiopulmonary problems most commonly associated with adults.

Linn et al. (2000) look at associations between carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and ozone and hospital admissions for cardiopulmonary complaints in Los Angeles from 1992 to 1995 with time series analysis. They find a significant relationship using a Poisson regression between carbon monoxide and cardiovascular admissions, but their analysis uncovers no significant differences among ethnic groups. Conversely, Gwynn and Thurston (2001) use time-series analysis to calculate the differences in relative risk of cardiopulmonary hospital admission from PM10, ozone, aerosol acidity, and sulfates among ethnic groups in New York. The disparity in relative risk was greatest between whites and Hispanics for ozone, but the differences did not prove to be significant. However, when insurance was used as a proxy for socioeconomic status, the relative risks were greater in noninsured and Medicaid patients for all ethnic groups, even non-Hispanic whites. Thus, the authors conclude that inadequate health care and poverty may explain differences in pollution-related health problems by ethnicity. Because people of color are disproportionately poor, they may have less access to health care, good quality housing, or other health resources, and thus pollution that aggravates existing health problems may have a higher marginal affect on people of color.

Whether traffic density or proximity necessarily causes or exacerbates health differences by race and by class remains controversial, however. In epidemiological studies of children, for example, studies show elevated risk fromcancer associated with proxies for exposure to vehicle exhaust, such as traffic volume and road proximity (Knox and Gilman 1997; Pearson, Wachtel, and Ebi 2000), while others have find little or no effect (Langholz et al. 2002; Reynolds et al. 2002; 2003). One fairly consistent finding, however, has been elevated levels of asthma hospitalizations or reduced respiratory capacity for children and adolescents residing near roadways with heavy traffic (Brunekreef et al. 1997; Ciccone et al. 1998; Duhme, Weiland, and Keil 1998; Edwards, Walters, and Griffiths 1994; English et al. 1999; Oosterlee et al. 1996; van Vliet et al. 1997; Wjst et al. 1993; Zhu et al. 2000). Wilkinson et al. (1999), however, find that proximity to heavy traffic has no significant effect in a case-control study of respiratory hospital admissions for four- to fifteen-year-olds in northwest London.

Prompted by these epidemiological studies, Gunier et al. (2003) undertake a statewide study of traffic density, emissions, and exposure to examine environmental justice. They use distance-weighted traffic data from the California Department of Transportation Highway Performance and Monitoring System. They then test for correlations between traffic density and three pollutants: benzene, 1,3-butadiene, and diesel particulate matter, and they find a significant relationship between traffic density and all three measured pollutant levels. But the air-quality data come from only twenty sites in the state for benzene and 1,3-butadiene.

Gunier et al. (2003) designate census block groups with more than 500,000 vehicle miles of travel per square mile as high-traffic density. In California, more than 215,000 children under the age of fifteen reside in these block groups. Using chi-square tests of difference, they find that households in the lowest income quartile (under $30,000 a year) are three times more likely to live in high-traffic density than the top quartile, and that median family income decreases with increasing traffic density for all racial groups except whites. Children of color similarly are three times more likely to live to in high-density block groups than white children. In intersectional analysis of both race and class, Gunier et al. (2003) find that black, Hispanic, and Asian children in the lowest income quintile are five times more likely than whites to live in high-traffic density blocks.

Another study used emissions model estimates of outdoor air toxics in the Los Angeles region. They rely on the Environmental Protection Agency’s Cumulative Exposure Project methodology to develop estimates of cancer risk by census tract (Morello-Frosch, Pastor, and Sadd 2001). These authors create five multivariate regression models in which the percentage of land in a census tract devoted to transportation activities was a strong predictor of cancer risk. They found that the population risk index was higher in subregions with greater numbers of racial and ethnic minorities, and that Latinos had the highest overall risk.

In another Los Angeles study, Macey et al. (2001) formulate OLS regressions to test for the connections between elevated blood lead levels (BLL), proximity to hazards such as toxic release inventory (TRI) facilities and roads, and ethnicity. They combine data from the TRI, the EPA’s cumulative exposure project, and the Los Angeles Department of Health Services Lead Hot Zone program in a GIS. They construct buffers around TRI facilities and major roadways as a proxy for exposure. In their model, they find that children from predominantly black and Hispanic neighborhoods have higher BLLs. Higher BLL is also associated with housing age and value—a common finding in public health literature on lead exposure. Probably their most interesting finding, however, is that proximity to freeways was the strongest predictor of BLL level, even stronger than the housing variables long associated with children’s risks of elevated BLL.

One research group has examined the effects of road proximity and pollution exposure on pregnancy outcomes. Wilhelm and Ritz (2003) conduct a case-control study of births in 112 zip codes within Los Angeles County, CA. Of these, 84 have at least one freeway, arterial, or major collector. Using a 500-foot buffer and assuming Gaussian distribution of pollution material fromthe roadway,Wilhelm and Ritz (2003) examine the effects of vehicle volumes on birth outcomes. The California Department of Health Services provided data from birth certificates. From these, the authors grouped births into three dichotomous categories: preterm births that occur with less than thirty-seven weeks of gestation, births with low birth weights under 2,500 grams, and full-term births. Like previous studies, the researchers divide traffic volumes into quintiles, but they include a binary variable to represent zip codes that had multiple freeways or major roads. They run logistic regressions of birth outcomes, controlling for known factors, such as maternal age, ethnicity, education, and class; first, second, or subsequent birth; prenatal care; infant sex; birth season and year; previous birth problems; and traffic volumes. In their series of regressions, Wilhelm and Ritz (2003) find that babies born to mothers living near heavy traffic were 10 percent to 20 percent more at risk of low birth weights. These effects were stronger during winter births. In analyses stratified by socioeconomic class, they found that in areas where the portion of children living in poverty was above the median, women in high-traffic areas had a 25 percent greater risk of having a low birth-weight child.

In addition to BLL or low birth weights, asthma and other respiratory illness have long concerned environmental justice researchers (American Lung Association 2001). Higher asthma rates among low-income, innercity residents has been a persistent finding in public health studies (Carr, Zeitel, andWeiss 1992; Fanta 2002; Gottlieb, Beiser, and O’Conner 1995; Lang and Polansky 1994; Malveaux and Fletchervincent 1995; Marder et al. 1992; Ostro et al. 1995; Volmer 2001). Within this research, air pollution coincides with other environmental stressors related to asthma, such as poor-quality housing or allergens. As communities have become aware of the connections between asthma and environmental conditions, environmental justice activists have initiated partnered studies on the relationships between road traffic and asthma.

Kinney et al. (2000) describe how residents of Harlem, NY, argued for a study on their sidewalks because of the high rates of asthma among children in the area. The researchers measured concentrations of very fine particulates (under 2.5 microns in diameter) by placing research staff equipped with personal monitors on sidewalks along four sample intersections in Harlem for five days. The staff sampled emissions for eight-hour shifts. Traffic counts were taken for at least two days, and as many as five days, at all four intersections.When they examined the data, they found little variation the overall level of fine particulates between the four sample locations. However, they did find that at the intersections with the highest freight and bus traffic, the levels of elemental carbon and diesel exhaust particulates were significantly higher than at the intersections with less freight and bus traffic.

In another community-led study, Loh et al. (2002) describe how youth activism in Roxbury, MA, led to an air-quality monitoring partnership between researchers, environmental justice advocates, and government. The project is known as AirBeat, and the goal is to set up a monitoring station that would provide hourly measurements ofPM2.5, ozone, and elemental carbon. These data are accessible to community residents via telephone, Web site, and a flag warning system. Based on the measurements derived fromthe monitoring station, residents documented Dudley Square as a pollution hotspot, and they use data to support demands for cleaner transit buses.

As we have shown, the research on air-quality distribution spans disciplines, including geography, planning, public health, epidemiology, and atmospheric science. Table 3 condenses the findings in this rapidly developing research area. Although the studies have used different methods, pollutants, and units of analysis, most studies have yielded similar results that lowincome and minority groups appear to bear a higher burden from pollution associated with transport in urban areas. This supports an economic study done by Bae (1997) who found the benefits of air-quality improvements in Los Angeles metropolitan region are progressively distributed. Although the results are consistent, most existing studies rely on simulated emissions data or extensive assumptions about exposure, dose, and health effects.Muchroomremains for studies based on pollution measurements rather than models. Community-based efforts, such as those described by Kinney et al. (2000) and Loh et al. (2002), open new avenues for data collection and pollution hotspot identification for planners and communities in air-quality management districts where existing monitor- ing data are few.

### Transport Good---Segregation / Racism

**Transit is a crucial factor in modern racial segregation**

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

c. Transit affects access to affordable housing **Transit decisions often contribute to economic and racial segregation in our metro areas**. Emphasis on one-usehighways ( i.e. multi-lane roads without sidewalks, bicycle access, or rapid bus routes) contributes to this segregation and severely restricts housing choices for people with disabilities, low-income people, and seniors.W hen a segment of a metro area is car-dependent, thosewho cannot afford automobiles or lack the ability todrive cannot live there even if the rents are within their means. Because public transportation covers limited areas, housing with easy access to transportation is at a premium. As urban living becomes more appealing toprofessionals trying to avoid long commutes (often due to sprawl), housing near public transit in urban cores and older suburbs grows more desirable and prices rise. 23 **Low-income people are priced out, often into suburbswhere they have no choice but to bear the expense of cars or to spend hours on multiple buses in order to getto work**. Even when rents in the suburbs are lower than in the gentrifying cores, the added expense of a car or the hours lost to commuting lower quality of life.

#### Current public transit perpetuates racist inequalities

Mann 96 (Eric Mann, Eric Mann is the director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles and a co-founder of the Bus Riders Union. The Strategy Center is a “think tank/act tank” that trains organizers and initiates high visibility environmental justice, mass transportation, and civil rights campaigns, “A NEW VISION

FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION”, 1996, http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf)

Describing and comparing the classes A) Daily ridership Every day 350,000 passengers use the MTA bus system, taking 1.3 million daily rides, while 26,000 passengers use the MTA’s rail system, taking only 96,000 daily rides. The bus riders are 81 percent Latino, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American, and the rail riders are about 50 percent white. But, on the most overcrowded inner-city buses the passengers are virtually 100 percent people of color, and on the most luxurious trains the passengers are almost 70 percent white. It is the apartheid-like nature of this transit system that is unusually disturbing, in which a small and declining white minority benefits so greatly from racist govern-ment policy, while an enormous and growing group of people of color suffer such abuse and discrimination. ¶ B) Racial composition: Bus vs. rail ¶ In cases such as Brown v. Board of Education, where a literal Jim Crow system was being challenged, it was hard for all but hard-core racists to justify such gross forms of racial segregation. However, in Los Angeles today, while the impacts of racism are just as pronounced, the form it takes is somewhat different, especially after some of the victories of the civil rights movement. ¶ For example, the Metrolink is the most “white” line, with a white ridership as high as 70 percent, serving some of the last overwhelmingly white suburbs in the region. But the entire demographic form of Los Angeles is now shaped by people of color, and there are virtually no majority white areas that can be reached without going through areas dominated by people of color. Moreover, the Bradley administration and the powerful African American and Latino voting coalitions in Los Angeles have made a substantial improvement in the conditions of a rather large strata of middle class people of color, whose activities have in-cluded breaking into areas of previously lily-white suburban housing. It is based on the above facts that the MTA argues in court that it cannot be practicing racial discrimination because many of the train lines carry more than 50 percent minority ridership, and “travel through” districts with an even higher percentage of people of color. ¶ However, these explanations fail to take into account that L.A. County is now 60 percent Latino, African American, Asian, and Native American and only 40 percent white. So, another way of understanding the bus/rail racial numbers is that on some of the most suburban trains, white people are represented by almost twice their percentage in the county. On the trains going through overwhelm-ingly minority communities, the white percentage is still almost the same as their population in the county. By contrast, on the buses, white ridership is only 19 percent (compared to their 40 percent of the county total), while black ridership is 22 per-cent (compared to their 11 percent of the county total), and Latino ridership is 47 percent (compared to 34 percent in the county). Moreover, the figure of 81 percent people of color on the bus system hides the fact that on the inner-city buses such as the Vermont 204 line—the most overcrowded bus line in the U.S. carrying 20,000 riders a day with a load factor of over 1.45—the passengers are almost entirely people of color. ¶ These stark statistics indicate that the trains are far more heavily white and the buses are far more heavily comprised of people of color, creating a strong racial character to each mode of transportation. These numbers say a lot, but sentiments sometimes give the story an added texture: the ¶ 15 ¶ MTA itself has had a long-standing inside joke (until we publicized it) calling its bus system, “a third class bus system for Third World People.” ¶ C) Economic status of ridership: Bus versus rail ¶ Too often in the popular discourse there is a false theoretical separation, in which “working class” is used to refer to white workers while “racial” and “ethnic” is used to refer to African American, Latino, and Asian communities, presented as totally undifferentiated in terms of their own class structure. But, it is as a discrete group that low-income people of color, the primary constituents that make up the class of bus riders, have been the victims of a number of brutal economic forces. ¶ First, the higher-paid unionized jobs that African Americans and Latinos fought their way into during the 1960s are for the most part gone—casualties as the U.S. made its brutal transition back to a low-wage nation and job exporter. The lower-wage working class jobs that have stayed in the U.S., with minimal job security, are filled by women and, increasingly, immigrants of color. Because of the disappearance of the unionized, high-wage jobs, “cyclical unemployment” has been replaced by structural unemployment, particularly in the black community. There is now a justified reluctance among many black men, in particular, to accept jobs that are clearly exploitative and of extremely low wage rates. Also, there is clear prejudice among employers against African Americans because of their history of militant and principled leadership in social justice movements. ¶ Second, the former role of the social welfare state to buttress low-wage workers from the worst ravages of a market economy is now under frontal attack from President Clinton and the Democrats, who agree that low-income women and men of color must be forcibly weaned from a “culture of dependence.” The massive resources of govern-ment are now more than ever turned to support large corporations in the world market and to pacify a voracious and racist white middle-class electorate, who simultaneously rail against “wel-fare” while supplementing their income through government-financed homeowners tax credits, FEMA earthquake relief payments, tax write-offs for home “business” expenses, and suburban rail systems with lap top computer terminals and childcare centers. As a result, the low-wage work-ing class must desperately struggle to beg, borrow, or steal enough funds to buy food, housing, cloth-ing, education, transportation, and medical care in the market. ¶ Third, the briefly fashionable view held during the 1960’s that society had some obligation to provide decent-paying jobs or adequate income for all its members has been replaced by the ideology of “an end to welfare as we know it” and the racialization, feminization, and criminalization of poverty. Laws such as “Three strikes and you’re out” and the re-legalization of the death penalty in many states are clearly aimed at incarcerating and killing African American and Latino youth, who are also overwhelmingly poor and working class. ¶ Thus, it is the African American, Latino, and Asian poor people who cannot afford existing MTA fares. It is the explosive relationship of identity between an increasingly minority (and female) low-wage workforce and an increasingly stratified U.S. class structure that goes to the heart of our civil rights challenge

#### Creating a movement to increase mass transit can solve racism and decrease the opportunity gaps.

Mann et al 06 (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/node/305)

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.

#### We should prioritize transportation equity as a means for solving environmental protection, civil rights, and government accountability

Stolz 5 (Rich, policy specialist at the Center for Community Change in D.C. where he staffs the Transportation Equity Network and the Center’s transportation and welfare-related initiatives, “A National Transportation Equity¶ Movement for Real Human Needs,” Race, Poverty, and the Environment, Winter 2005/2006, http://urbanhabitat.org/files/21Rich.Stolz-Laura.Barret.pdf)

Although victorious in some aspects of SAFETEALU, other elements of TEN’s reauthorization agenda,¶ such as strengthening enforcement of federal civil¶ rights and environmental justice requirements in¶ federal legislation, never gained traction in Congress,¶ or for that matter, among the broader coalition of¶ national allied constituencies. This was partly because¶ of the nature of the congressional leadership in this¶ Congress and partly because progressive forces were¶ focused on preventing major losses in environmental¶ legislation and regulation. Most importantly, many¶ in the civil rights and environmental justice communities were concerned with reversing the impact of¶ the 2001 Supreme Court decision limiting the scope¶ of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.¶ While there will be much to do in the coming¶ years to realize the victories that TEN accomplished¶ in the reauthorization of the federal transportation¶ bill, it is not too early to begin imagining what¶ might be possible when the next reauthorization¶ cycle comes in 2009.¶ Transportation is an issue that intersects a wide¶ range of progressive causes—environmental protection, disability rights, civil rights, government¶ accountability and transparency, sustainable economic¶ development, smart growth, and rural access to¶ services. The extent to which transportation planning¶ and projects impact low-income and transitdependent communities must be a key factor in all¶ discussions, and work needs to be done to bring the¶ various constituencies together under a common¶ vision of environmental justice. With limited¶ resources, grassroots groups were able to accomplish¶ much with the enactment of SAFETEA-LU.¶ Foundations and other financial supporters should¶ give greater priority to transportation equity and put¶ more resources into supporting organization and leadership development among affected communities.¶ Finally, in national conversations about policies on¶ poverty and the environment, transportation equity¶ should be considered on a par with affordable housing¶ and air quality.

### AT No Transpo Discriminiation

#### Transportation spending is fundamentally biased against people of color and low socioeconomic class – 3 reasons

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

From 1998-2003, TEA-2141 transportation spending amounted to $217 billion.41 This was the "largest public works bill enacted in the nation's history. '42 Transportation spending has always been about opportunity and equity. In the real world, costs and benefits associated with transportation developments are not randomly distributed. 43 Transportation justice is concerned with factors that may create and/or exacerbate inequities and measures to prevent or correct disparities in benefits and costs."a Disparate transportation outcomes can be subsumed under three broad categories of inequity: procedural, geographic, and social.45 Procedural Inequity: Attention is directed to the process by which transportation decisions may or may not be carried out in a uniform, fair, and consistent manner with involvement of diverse public stakeholders.46 Do the rules apply equally to everyone? Geographic Inequity: Transportation decisions may have distributive impacts (positive and negative) that are geographic and spatial, such as rural versus urban versus central city.47 Some communities are physically located on the "wrong side of the tracks" and often receive substandard transportation services. 48 Social Inequity: Transportation benefits and burdens are not randomly distributed across population groups.49 Generally, transportation amenities (benefits) accrue to the wealthier and more educated segment of society, while transportation disamenities (burdens) fall disproportionately on people of color and individuals at the lower end of the socioeconomic spectrum.50 Intergenerational equity issues are also subsumed under this category. 51 The impacts and consequences of some transportation decisions may reach into several generations. 2 Heavy government investment in road infrastructure may be contributing to an increase in household transportation costs. 53

#### Urban transit benefits are concentrated in the affluent minority while ignoring the underserved majority

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

In the real world, all transit is not created equal. In general, most transit systems have taken their low-income and people of color "captive riders" for granted and concentrated their fare and service policies on attracting middle-class and affluent riders out of their cars. 61 Moreover, transit subsidies have favored investment in suburban transit and expensive new commuter bus and rail lines that disproportionately serve wealthier "discretionary riders."'63 Almost 40% of rural counties in this country have little or no pub-lic transportation, 64 and "[i]n areas with populations from one million and below, more than half of all transit passengers have incomes of less than $15,000 per year. 65 In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos comprise over 54% of transit users (62% of bus riders, 35% of subway riders, and 29% of commuter rail riders).66 Nationally, only about 5.3% of all Americans use public transit to get to work.67 African Americans are almost six times as likely as whites to use transit to get around. 68 Urban transit is especially important to African Americans where over 88% live in metropolitan areas 69 and over 53% live inside central cities. 70 About 60% of African Americans live in ten metropolitan areas.7" The metropolitan areas with the largest black population include New York (2.3 million), Chicago (1 million), Detroit (0.8 million), Philadelphia (0.7 million), Houston (0.5 million), Baltimore (0.4 million), Los Angeles (0.4 million), Memphis (0.4 million), Washington, DC (0.35 million), and New Orleans (0.3 million). 72 Nearly 60% of transit riders are served by the ten largest urban transit systems and the remaining 40% by the other 5000 transit systems.73

#### Unrepresented minorities are empirically shortchanged for the benefit of the powerful elite in transportation policies

Bullard 4 (Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

Lack of car ownership and inadequate public transit service in many central cities and metropolitan regions with a high proportion of "captive" transit dependents exacerbate social, economic, and racial isolation, especially for low-income people of color-residents who already have limited transportation options.78 Nationally, only 7% of white households do not own a car, compared with 24% of African American households, 17% of Latino households, and 13% of Asian-American households. 79 People of color are fighting to get representation on transportation boards and commissions, and to get their fair share of transit dollars, services, bus shelters and other amenities, handicapped accessible vehicles, and affordable fares. Some groups are waging grassroots campaigns to get "dirty diesel" buses and bus depots from being dumped in their neighborhoods.80 The campaign to "Dump Dirty Diesels" is about the right to breathe clean air and protect public health.8 ' Such efforts are not "sexy" campaigns; they are life and death struggles. Rosa Parks would have a difficult time sitting on the front or back of a Montgomery bus today, since the city dismantled its public bus system-which served mostly blacks and poor people.8 2 The cuts were made at the same time that federal tax dollars boosted the construction of the region's extensive suburban highways. 83 The changes in Montgomery took place amid growing racial geographic segregation and tension between white and black members of the city council.84 The city described its actions "publicly as fiscally necessary, even as Montgomery received large federal transportation subsidies to fund renovation of non-transit improvements. 85 Windy Cooler, an organizer with the Montgomery Transportation Coalition ("MTC"), describes racial diversity on her region's metropolitan planning organization ("MPO"): In a city that is 50% African-American where historically and even today, the black community is so egregiously underserved and largely unheard, and where citizens, regardless of color are uninvolved and uneducated in the [transportation] planning process, it is no wonder, in fact it is inevitable, that the needs of the few, who are powerful for the moment, are put above the needs of the whole.86

#### There are empirical examples of transit racism

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

Community groups are fighting to end the kind of transit racism that killed seventeen-year-old Cynthia Wiggins of Buffalo, New York.95 Wiggins, an African American, was crushed by a dump truck while crossing a seven-lane highway, because Buffalo's Number Six bus, an inner-city bus used mostly by African Americans, was not allowed to stop at the suburban Walden Galleria Mall.96 Cynthia had not been able to find a job in Buffalo, but she was able to secure work at a fast-food restaurant in the suburban mall.97 The bus stopped about 300 yards away from the mall. 98 The Wiggins family and other members of the African American community charged the Walden Galleria Mall with using the highway as a racial barrier to exclude some city residents. 99 The highprofile trial, argued by Johnnie L. Cochran, Jr., began on November 8, 1999. °° The lawsuit was settled ten days later when the mall owners, Pyramid Companies of Syracuse, agreed to pay $2 million of the $2.55 million settlement, over time, to Wiggins's four-year old son.10 1 The Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority agreed to pay $300,000, and the driver of the truck agreed to pay $250,000.102

### AT Transpo Not Important

#### Transportation is a fundamental human rights issue

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

Lest anyone dismiss transportation as a tangential issue, consider that Americans spend more on transportation than any other household expense except housing.54 On average, Americans spend $0.19 out of every dollar earned on transportation expenses. 55 Transportation costs ranged from 17.1% in the Northeast to 20.8% in the South 6 -where some 54% of African Americans reside. Americans spend more on transportation than they do on food, education, and health care. 58 The nation's poorest families spend more than 40% of their take home pay on transportation. 9 This is not a small point since African American households tend to earn less money than white households.60 Nationally, African Americans earn only $649 per $1000 earned by whites. 61 This means that the typical black household in the United States earned 35% less than the typical white household.

### Transport Good---EJ

#### Transportation Infrastructure developed through a lens of Environmental Justice can create a more equitable community while saving money in the long term and mitigating climate change

**ICF 11** [ICF International, ICF International (NASDAQ:ICFI) partners with government and commercial clients to deliver industry expertise and innovative analytics in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets. “Environmental Justice Emerging Trends and Best Practices Guidebook”, <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/resources/guidebook/ejguidebook110111.pdf>, November 1, 2011] SV

Improvements to public transit service can provide residents with greater access to jobs, schools, health care facilities, and shopping. Improved access may, in turn, increase property values. At the same time, communities through which transportation facilities (e.g., highways, fixed guideway transit) are built may gain greater mobility access, but may also suffer from construction disruptions and loss of existing homes and businesses. When poorly planned, transportation projects can also be visually unattractive, affecting the social and economic fabric of neighborhoods. Environmental impacts can negatively affect the health of residents and natural systems. 4 Vehicles release pollutants into the air that residents breathe. Vehicles also release pollutants on roads, which can then wash into lakes and streams, affecting water quality. 5 Noise and vibration are two other types of environmental effects, especially associated with high-speed auto, freight, train, and airplane travel. Safety is yet another concern affecting all highways, roads, rail lines, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Roads can be dangerous to travel along and cross on foot or bicycle. Improvements to intersections, rail crossings, sidewalks (including lighting), crosswalks, and bicycle lanes can improve safety and accessibility for all types of travelers. 6 Promoting Environmental Justice through Transportation Investments By targeting transportation funding to support reinvestment in existing communities, agencies can build more choice, convenience, cost-effectiveness, and equity into the transportation system, while rectifying adverse community effects caused by previously developed facilities. Changing demographics and evolving markets are increasing the demand for compact, walkable neighborhoods that offer a range of housing and transportation choices. Coordinating transportation and investments can help ensure that walking, biking, and traveling by transit are safe, convenient, and realistic choices for more people. Linking those investments with improved multimodal programming, management, and operations can help make transportation systems more accessible, efficient, and equitable. In a time of economic challenges and fiscal constraint, limited transportation funds can be more effectively focused on projects that support economic revitalization and community development, while improving transportation and housing affordability and quality of life for all residents. The same may be true for towns and villages in rural areas, which are struggling to remain economically competitive, while also preserving community character and maintaining viable mobility options. Rural communities often present unique mobility challenges, such as greater driving distance between activities and destinations, fewer public transit options, and a lack of infrastructure for walking and wheeling. When a small town is divided by a State highway that serves as a main street, roadway capacity improvements can further limit transportation choice. 7 Applying EJ and livability principles to roadway improvements, downtown redevelopment, and adjacent growth areas can help improve mobility and access to services and activities for all citizens. It can also help support long-term improvements to transit connections between communities. Linking transportation investments to compact development and community revitalization strategies can also preserve natural and cultural resources, while reducing long-term infrastructure costs. Compact development requires less land, while shorter, narrower streets produce less stormwater runoff and cost less to build and maintain. Providing multimodal choices can reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, serving as an effective climate change mitigation strategy, while also safeguarding communities that are most vulnerable to the potential effects of climate change on aging transportation infrastructure. In the process of ensuring that people of all ages have real choices to walk and wheel in the course of daily living, and making mobility choices amenable to a range of abilities, transportation practitioners can support active living and help improve health and quality of life for all populations. Rather than simply mitigating the impacts of transportation investments, fully incorporating environmental justice in transportation decisionmaking can help improve a community's human, social, and environmental health.

#### Transportation racism is a major environmental justice issue – it affects every aspect of life

Sze and London 8 – \*Associate Professor in American Studies, University of California at Davis AND \*\*Director of the UC Davis Center for the Study of Regional Change (Julie, founding Director of the Environmental Justice Project of the John Muir Institute of the Environment; and Jonathan K., Ph.D. in Environmental Science Policy and Management form UC Berkeley, Senior Researcher in the UC Davis Department of Human and Community Development and the Environmental Justice Project in the John Muir Institute of the Environment; 2008, “Environmental Justice at the Crossroads,” *Sociology Compass*, Volume 2, Number 4, pp. 1331-1354, http://ams.ucdavis.edu/~jsze/ex/Sze\_and\_London\_sociology.pdf)

Judging by quantity alone, environmental justice analyses of transportation issues is a dominant feature of the recent literature. On the issue of access, critiques of transportation planning have observed that low-income and communities of color often suffer from transit options that are limited, inconvenient, low quality, and high cost (Bullard and Johnson 1997; Cohen and Hobson 2004), leaving residents with limited mobility and therefore means to access employment, services, education, recreation, and other local and regional opportunities. Robert Bullard (2004) describes the chronic inequality in access to transportation by people of color as ‘transportation racism’ and shows how government policies and urban and regional planning regimes limit physical, social, and economic mobility. Transportation impacts have not only focused primarily on the health effects of air pollution from vehicles (Liu 1996; Morello-Frosch et al. 2005; Prakash 2007; Sanchez and Wolf 2007; Schweitzer and Valenzuela 2004), but also address issues of pollution to neighborhood due to noise (Sobotta et al. 2007) and toxic spills (Schweitzer 2006).

#### Conventional transportation perpetuates urban-sprawl and inflicts severe environmental harms on minorities---better public transport is key

Bullard 4 (Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

Transportation-related sources account for over 30% of the primary smog-forming pollutants emitted nationwide and 28% of the fine particulates.183 Vehicle emissions are the main reasons 121 Air Quality Districts in the United States are in noncompliance with the 1970 Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards. 184 Over 140 million Americans, of whom 25% are children, live, work, and play in areas where air quality does not meet national standards. 85 Emissions from cars, trucks, and buses cause 25-51% of the air pollution in the nation's non-attainment areas. 8 6 Transportation related emissions also generate more than a quarter of the greenhouse gases. 187 Improvements in transportation investments and air quality are of special significance to African Americans and other people of color who are more likely to live in areas with reduced air quality when compared to whites. l8 National Argonne Laboratory re-searchers discovered that 57% of whites, 65% of African Americans, and 80% of Latinos lived in the 437 counties that failed to meet at least one of the EPA ambient air quality standards.189 A 2000 study from the American Lung Association shows that children of color are disproportionately. represented in areas with high ozone levels.' 90 Additionally, 61.3% of Black children, 69.2% of Hispanic children and 67.7% of Asian-American children live in areas that exceed the 0.08 ppm ozone standard, while only 50.8% of white children live in such areas. 91 Reduction in motor vehicle emissions can have marked health improvements. For example, the CDC reports that "when the Atlanta Olympic Games in 1996 brought about a reduction in auto use by 22.5%, asthma admissions to ERs and hospitals also decreased by 41.6%. ' '192 The CDC researchers also concluded that "less driving, better public transport, well designed landscape and residential density will improve air quality more than will additional roadways.' 93 Excessive ozone pollution contributed to 86,000 asthma attacks in Baltimore, 27,000 in Richmond, and 130,000 in Washingt6n, D.C.1 94 Air pollution from vehicle emissions causes significant amounts of illness, hospitalization, and premature death. 195 A 2002 study in Lancet reports a strong causal link between ozone and asthma.196 Ground-level ozone may exacerbate health problems such as asthma, nasal congestions, throat irritation, respiratory tract inflammation, reduced resistance to infection, changes in cell function, loss of lung elasticity, chest pains, lung scarring, formation of lesions within the lungs, and premature aging of lung tissues.'19 7 Air pollution claims 70,000 lives a year, nearly twice the number killed in traffic accidents. 19 A 2001 CDC report, Creating a Healthy Environment: The Impact of the Built Environment on Health, points a finger at transportation and sprawl as major health threats. 199 Although it is difficult to put a single price tag on the cost of air pollution, estimates range from $10 billion to $200 billion per year.200 Asthma is the number one reason for childhood emergency room visits in most major cities in the country.201 The hospitalization rate for African Americans is three to four times the rate for whites. 2 2 African Americans are three times more likely than whites to die from asthma.20 3 Getting sick is complicated for the nation's uninsured. Blacks and Hispanics are most at risk of being uninsured.0 4 Blacks and Hispanics now comprise 52.6% of the 43 million Americans without health insurance.2 0 5 Nearly one-half of working-age Hispanics lacked health insurance for all or part of the year prior to the survey, as did almost one-third of African Americans.20 6 In comparison, one-fifth of whites and Asian Americans ages eighteen to sixty-four lacked coverage for all or part of the year.20 7

#### A lack of public transportation has created economic and environmental injustice

Owens et al. 8 – Research Associate at the Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University (Edward Owens; Gwen Goodwin, Research Associate in the Center for Transportation Training & Research at Texas Southern University; Carol Lewis, Ph.D. in political science from the University of Houston, associate professor in Transportation Studies and Director of the Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University, former manager and director of planning at the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, executive assistant to Mayor Bill White for Transportation Planning; Jeffery Mallory, Research Associate at Center for Transportation Training and Research at Texas Southern University; May 2008, “An Evaluation of Environmental Justice and Environmental Equity: Laws and Issues that Affect Minority and Low-Income Populations,” http://swutc.tamu.edu/publications/technicalreports/167921-1.pdf)

Many people believe that communities of color, especially those within inner cities, are subjected to a variety of environmental and economic injustices. An article published called “Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity” (Bullard et. al., 2004) notes that some of our transportation policies and practices still destroy stable neighborhoods, separate and disperse communities, leaving disconnected neighborhoods struggling to survive. These communities are often removed from enclaves of jobs and economic growth centers. Further, a number of authors contend that reliance on the automobile, current land use practices and transportation designs perpetuate suburban sprawl. Large numbers of people commuting to urban area jobs add to the problems of air pollution and traffic congestion. Dispersed development patterns are particularly hard on low income residents, who are transit dependent. A history of locating facilities known to be high polluters in communities of color further encourages segregation and increases white flight to the suburbs, which lowers the tax base from inner cities and can exacerbate urban inner city financial problems. Additionally, the rapid development of a city’s outlying areas uses excessive amounts of vacant land, which are important to a region’s ecological balance, leading to unsustainable communities.

In addition to job access, people who are elderly, mobility-impaired, or have low incomes rely on public transportation to link with essential services, educational and employment opportunities, health care, social and other governmental services. Officials responsible for choosing the location of public and health facilities typically focus on the lowest immediate costs associated with site acquisition. For federal, state, county and municipal public service offices, this issue is particularly acute since public revenues are scarce and highly competitive. Often forgotten in the long-term success of a facility is whether a transportation system exists, which can provide efficient, affordable access for the people who need the services most. The real cost of the facility is not considered, if the transportation costs for accessibility are disproportionately borne by those who can least afford the funds.

Recent efforts target inclusion in the planning and locating of transportation projects and public facilities. Steady improvement has been realized over the last several decades, reversing past trends where minorities and other underrepresented groups did not have the opportunity to participate in the planning process for public facilities. Historically, individuals from these communities had little or no influence on public projects that impacted their neighborhoods. Another problem is that cumulative project effects are not well considered in the planning process. For example, a department of transportation constructing a roadway does not consider a factory under construction along the planned roadway. Thus, environmental impact for each project will be evaluated separately, underestimating the potential affect on nearby residences. In his work, Dr. Robert Bullard (1993), the Director of Environmental Justice Resources Center at Clark Atlanta University, writes that environmental justice linked with sustainability and cumulative risks such as the ones just described should be addressed in the public planning, review and decision making.

Minority, low income and other historically underrepresented communities need confidence that government policies will focus on environmental, social and comprehensive analyses in planning and implementing public projects. The trends toward greater and more varied avenues of communication must continue. Each department of transportation that responded to a survey associated with this research has increased its outreach and inclusion in its transportation project development process. They are incorporating known community leaders and organizations as liaisons, bolstering traditional public involvement processes. This has allowed greater voice to individuals that are not traditionally heard.

#### Neglect of infrastructure for the poor has destroyed environmental justice

Lee 2/7 – from the UC San Diego Urban Studies and Planning Program (Jenny, 2/7/12, “Public Participation and Equity in Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Case Studies of Social Equity Committees,” research study submitted to the Urban Studies and Planning Program at UC San Diego, http://www.seniorsequence.net/images/student\_files/SRP\_FinalFINALdraft1.docx)

City-regions and MPOs face significant issues regarding the future as they confront changing demographics, global climate change, and global competitors. One important question that city-regions must deal with is that of equity. Due to decades of disinvestment from all levels of government, many communities of color and low-income communities (also called Environmental Justice or EJ populations) have been left behind in economic development and educational attainment, which hurts our regions and our nation as a whole in the global picture. It is expected that the United States will be a “majority minority” country by the year 2042 (PolicyLink Report 2011). As communities of color mostly face systematic and social disinvestment and inequity, this has important implications for the future of our regions and country.

It is clear that infrastructure is a key driver towards equity by linking people to job centers, educational centers, and having the potential to promote sustainable ways of growth. Regional governments have an important role to play in infrastructure developments, especially in transportation, since MPOs are charged with distributing federal transportation funding to local governments. Yet how much of meaningful input and participation do low-income communities and people of color have in determining infrastructure investments made by their regional governments? Planning is often full of professional jargon that can prove daunting, and meetings can be inaccessible if people have no means of getting there, if they work, or cannot afford childcare during the hours that the meeting is held. Due to recent federal laws, MPOs have made more proactive efforts at including traditionally underrepresented communities into the public participation process, through efforts like holding public workshops, using social media, and collaborating with community-based organizations. However, while the input of these communities may be taken into consideration and incorporated into the process of various land-use and transportation plans, it does not guarantee accountability in following through with those plans, as infrastructure investments take decades to implement.

#### Insufficient public transportation reduces quality of life for city residents – that is an environmental justice issue

Swanston 99 – Chief of the Eastern Field Unit of the New York State Department of Environmental

Conservation’s Division of Environmental Enforcement (Samara F., Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Hunter College Adjunct division of the City University of New York agency, Spring 1999, “Environmental Justice and Environmental Quality Benefits: The Oldest, Most Pernicious Struggle and Hope for Burdened Communities,” *Vermont Law Review*, Volume 23, pp. 545-566, p. HeinOnline)

Access to these parks and transportation to them is the key to the ability to enjoy the benefit. Without an automobile or reasonably priced public transportation, full use and enjoyment of the six million acre Adirondack Park, or any of the other 233 state parks and historic places outside the city is severely limited, as is enjoyment of their environmental quality benefits. Therefore, urban residents routinely support a state park system which most will never see or enjoy and where most of the quality of life and environmental quality benefits inure to suburban or rural residents, who already enjoy a better, healthier quality of life. This inequity is also true on a national level. More than eighty percent of people of color in this country live in urban areas and subsidize public lands in suburban or rural areas, although they generally have little access to these public lands or to the previously-discussed benefits of access. In some cases, these are environmental quality benefits that urban residents do not know about. However, this still raises important issues respecting equity in funding and support for these resources and the state's role in assuring that all New Yorkers have their open space and environmental quality needs met, regardless of resources or ability.8

Diversity in park use is an environmental justice issue that should not be dismissed. People who live near public land have not been shy about their opposition to having other people enjoy those lands.49 Since people of color typically do not live in these areas, they are more likely to attract attention and opposition if they attempt to access public lands in remote or rural areas. In fact, according to the State Department of Environmental Conservation, in some cases, the vast majority of actions it takes for just maintenance of public lands are administrative actions needed to confirm and uphold the public right of access." Even when public access is technically available, if access is not clearly marked, people of color may be reluctant to visit public lands or trails because of historical racism and patterns of exclusion.5 When the government uses the power of the state to facilitate greater access to public lands for some groups, at the expense of people of color, the result is an important environmental justice issue for the disenfranchised communities.52

#### Transportation equity is a major environmental justice issue – current policy only focuses on the wealthy

Litman 2 – executive director of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (Todd, 2002, “Evaluating Transportation Equity,” *World Transport Policy & Practice*, Volume 8, Number 2, pp. 50-65, http://www.eco-logica.co.uk/pdf/wtpp08.2.pdf)

Equity is often evaluated with regard to income class or social class. This reflects the assumption that lower income and socially disadvantaged people should bear a smaller share of costs or receive a greater share of public resources. As economist Adam Smith (1776) wrote, ‘It is not very unreasonable that the rich should contribute to the public expense, not only in proportion to their revenue but something more than in that proportion’.4 A price or tax structure that increases with wealth (rich people pay proportionally more of their income than poor people) is called ‘progressive’, while pricing and taxes that are borne proportionally more by lower income groups are called ‘regressive’.

The economic principle of ‘diminishing returns’ (more properly called ‘diminishing marginal utility’) supports progressive pricing. This principle means that beyond some point the incremental benefits of any input (including money) start to decline. For example, an additional $5,000 to a low-income household can increase the purchase of necessities such as food, shelter and medical care, providing significant welfare benefits. The same $5,000 to a wealthy household may provide little welfare gain, particularly if others in their community received a similar increase in income.

An implication of this principle is that conditions facing the most disadvantaged members of society may be the best indicator of overall social and economic progress. For example, an increase in wealth or opportunity to the poorest 10% of the population may provide far greater social welfare than the same proportional increase for a richer group, all else being equal.

Applied to transportation this principle implies that the quality of access for people who are mobility disadvantaged is one of the most important indicators of transportation system performance. In an automobile dependent society this may justify increasing attention to providing basic mobility and access for non-drivers. These issues are sometimes called ‘environmental justice’ (DeSanto & Bailey, 1999). The book Just Transportation includes essays arguing that the distribution of costs and benefits is unfair in the current transport system (Bullard & Johnson, 1997). It shows, for example, how transit funding in Los Angeles provides far more subsidy for wealthier rail users than for poorer, mostly minority bus riders. Similarly, it cites cases in which lower income neighbourhoods are negatively impacted by transportation projects, while receiving little benefit.

#### Vehicle emissions create health problems for city residents – the plan solves that and creates economic opportunity

Bullard et al. 2 – Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University (Robert D., Ph.D. in Sociology from Iowa State University, former Ware Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, former Professor of Sociology at UC Riverside, former Associate Professor and Visiting Scholar at UC Berkeley, former Associate Professor at the University of Tennessee; Glenn S. Johnson, Research Associate in the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Clark Atlanta University; and Angel O. Torres, Geographical Information Systems/TRI Training Specialist with the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Adjunct Professor of Sociology at Clark Atlanta University; 10/23/02, “Transportation Justice for All: Addressing Equity in the 21st Century,” Second National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit - Summit II, Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/summit2/TranspJustice.pdf)

Having the support from Ford, GM, and Chrysler were important, but getting the mostly black Detroit and it mostly white suburbs to agree on regional transit was even more important. Much of the credit for getting the plan accepted by the public was carried out by citizens groups on the ground who saw transit in metro Detroit as an economic, quality of life, health, and environmental justice issue.

Vehicles emissions have created a major air quality and health problem in metro Detroit. Bad air hits children with asthma and other respiratory illnesses especially hard. Over 39 percent of Detroit children have asthma-- three times the national rate.23 Proponents of regional transit marketed their plan with supporting clean air and public health, and it worked.

From New York City to Los Angeles, community leaders are demanding an end to unfair subsidies between urban transit “dependent” riders and suburban “choice” riders and tax dollars that subsidize highway development on the suburban fringe. Transportation dollars are aiding and abetting flight of people, jobs, and development to the suburban fringe. Groups are also struggling to get public transit systems linked to jobs and economic activity centers. They are also challenging public transportation decisions, types of transit (i.e., rail vs buses, diesel vs clean fuels), unfair fare hikes, distribution of amenities, modernization, and enhancement projects that shortchange poor people and people of color.

Community groups are fighting to end the kind of transit racism that killed 17-year-old Cynthia Wiggins of Buffalo, New York. Wiggins, an African American, was crushed by a dump truck while crossing a seven-lane highway because Buffalo’s Number Six bus, an inner-city bus used mostly by African Americans, was not allowed to stop at the suburban Walden Galleria Mall. Cynthia had not been able to find a job in Buffalo but was able to secure work at a fast-food restaurant in the suburban mall. The bus stopped about 300 yards short of the mall.

### AT No EJ Discrimination

#### EJ has a Disparate impact

**Bullard et al 7** [Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University. He is the author of thirteen books that address sustainable development, environmental racism, urban land use, industrial facility siting, community reinvestment, housing, transportation and smart growth. His book, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality (Westview Press, 2000), is a standard text in the environmental justice field. His most recent books include Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World (Earthscan/MIT Press, 2003), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity (South End Press, 2004), The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution (Sierra Club Books, 2005), Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity (MIT Press, 2007) and The Black Metropolis in the Twenty­First Century: Race, Power and the Politics of Place (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming May 2007). Paul Mohai is Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was an early and major contributor to the growing body of quantitative research examining the disproportionate environmental burdens in low­income and people of color communities. A significant outcome of this early research was the organization of the historic 1990 “Michigan Conference on Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards” with colleague Dr. Bunyan Bryant. Dr. Mohai also has been a major contributor to research examining the environmental attitudes of African Americans and their influence on the environmental movement. His current research involves national­level studies examining cause and effect relationships in the distribution of environmental hazards by race and class, including examining the role environmental factors play in accounting for racial and socioeconomic disparities in health. He is the author of numerous articles on the subject of race and the environment. Robin Saha is Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Montana and affiliated faculty with its School of Public and Community Health Sciences. He is among the leading scholars conducting quantitative studies of environmental inequality using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). His articles appear in leading social science journals including Demography and Social Problems. His teaching and research focuses on the intersection of environmental justice, health and policy with an emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. He is committed to providing assistance to contaminated communities and works actively on tribal environmental issues. One of his current community­based research projects focuses on substandard housing and environmental health on Montana Indian reservations. He also consults on environmental justice legal cases and conducts environmental justice analyses for a wide variety of nonprofit advocacy organizations. Beverly Wright is a sociologist and the founding director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ) at Dillard University (formerly at Xavier University of Louisiana) in New Orleans. She is a leading scholar, advocate and activist in the environmental justice arena. She served on the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for the state of Louisiana and on the city of New Orleans' Select Committee for the Sewerage and Water Board. She is co­chair of the National Black Environmental Justice Network and the Environmental Justice Climate Change (EJCC) Initiative. She is the co­author of In the Wake of the Storm: Environment, Disaster and Race after Katrina (Russell Sage Foundation, May 2006). She is a native of New Orleans and a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty 1987—2007”, <http://www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/toxic20.pdf>, March 2007] SV

Race matters. People of color and persons of low socioeconomic status are still disproportionately impacted and are particularly concentrated in neighborhoods and communities with the greatest number of facilities. Race continues to be an independent predictor of where hazardous wastes are located, and it is a stronger predictor than income, education and other socioeconomic indicators. People of color now comprise a majority in neighborhoods with commercial hazardous waste facilities, and much larger (more than two­thirds) majorities can be found in neighborhoods with clustered facilities. African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos and Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders alike are disproportionately burdened by hazardous wastes in the U.S. Place matters. People of color are particularly concentrated in neighborhoods and communities with the greatest number of hazardous waste facilities, a finding that directly parallels that of the original UCC report. This current appraisal also reveals that racial disparities are widespread throughout the country, whether one examines EPA regions, states or metropolitan areas, where the lion’s share of facilities is located. Significant racial and socioeconomic disparities exist today despite the considerable societal attention to the problem noted in this report. These findings raise serious questions about the ability of current policies and institutions to adequately protect people of color and the poor from toxic threats. Unequal protection places communities of color at special risk. Not only are people of color differentially impacted by toxic wastes and contamination, they can expect different responses from the government when it comes to remediation—as clearly seen in the two case studies in Post­Katrina New Orleans and in Dickson County, Tennessee. Thus, it does not appear that existing environmental, health and civil rights laws and local land use controls have been adequately applied or adapted to reducing health risks or mitigating various adverse impacts to families living in or near toxic “hot spots.”

#### Race is consistent with environmental inequity—strong statistical support

**Nova 4** [Villanova, The Book of Resolutions of The United Methodist Church, “Environmental Racism”, <http://www3.villanova.edu/mission/CSTresource/ecology/Methodist.pdf>, 2004] SV

1. Race is consistently the most statistically significant variable in the location of commercial hazardous waste facilities. Three of the five largest commercial hazardous waste landfills in the United States are located in communities of color; communities with commercial hazardous waste facilities have two to three times the average minority population of communities without such facilities; and three out of every five African Americans and Hispanic North Americans live in communities with toxic waste sites.1 The African American community of Mossville in rural Louisiana is home to over thirty petrochemical and industrial plants located within a two-mile area. A U.S. government report in 1999 highlighted alarming levels of dioxin in the blood of the residents and linked those levels to local exposures. 2. Communities where hazardous waste incinerators are sited tend to have large minority populations, low incomes, and low property values. The minority portion of the population in communities with existing incinerators is ninety-eight percent higher than the national average. In Houston, Texas, six of eight municipal incinerators are located in predominantly African American neighborhoods.2 3. The asthma rate among African American children is 26 higher than that among white children. (US CDC) In 2002, 71 percent of African Americans live in counties that violate federal clean air standards compared with 58 percent of whites. 4. Fifty percent of the children in the United States suffering from lead poisoning are African American. At every income level, black children are contaminated with lead at twice the rate of white children. 5. Farm workers' children (mainly Hispanics) in the United States suffer a higher rate of birth defects due to their mothers' exposure to pesticides during the early stages of pregnancy. In farm worker communities, children with cancer are common. Pesticide exposure among farm workers can result in death, birth defects, cancer, nerve disorders, skin diseases, and other health complications. 6. Navajo teenagers have cancer rates seventeen times the national average, due to countless uranium spills on Navajo lands that contaminated their water, air, and soil.3

#### Despite the establishment of the Office of Environmental Equity environmental racism pervades our communities

**Nova 4** [Villanova, The Book of Resolutions of The United Methodist Church, “Environmental Racism”, <http://www3.villanova.edu/mission/CSTresource/ecology/Methodist.pdf>, 2004] SV

In response to the demands of the environmental justice community, the Environmental Protection Agency established the Office of Environmental Equity (later changed to Office of Environmental Justice) to address inequities in environmental protection. In 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898 requiring federal agencies to develop strategies for ensuring compliance with principles of environmental justice and with a commitment that all communities have the right to safe and healthy environments. Despite the clear evidence and growing awareness our society's attitude toward the production and disposal of hazardous products remains one of "out of sight, out of mind." But "out of sight, out of mind" is most often where the poor and powerless live and work. These communities have thus become toxic "sacrifice zones." Hazardous waste is still exposed in many communities such as Aniston, Alabama even in the year 2003. The work must continue. We must be persistent and consistent in exposing these atrocities with a commitment that all communities have a right to safe and healthy environments.

#### Status quo doesn’t solve and the EPA is terrible—uniformly applied equal protection is key

**Bullard et al 7** [Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University. He is the author of thirteen books that address sustainable development, environmental racism, urban land use, industrial facility siting, community reinvestment, housing, transportation and smart growth. His book, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality (Westview Press, 2000), is a standard text in the environmental justice field. His most recent books include Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World (Earthscan/MIT Press, 2003), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity (South End Press, 2004), The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution (Sierra Club Books, 2005), Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity (MIT Press, 2007) and The Black Metropolis in the Twenty­First Century: Race, Power and the Politics of Place (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming May 2007). Paul Mohai is Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was an early and major contributor to the growing body of quantitative research examining the disproportionate environmental burdens in low­income and people of color communities. A significant outcome of this early research was the organization of the historic 1990 “Michigan Conference on Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards” with colleague Dr. Bunyan Bryant. Dr. Mohai also has been a major contributor to research examining the environmental attitudes of African Americans and their influence on the environmental movement. His current research involves national­level studies examining cause and effect relationships in the distribution of environmental hazards by race and class, including examining the role environmental factors play in accounting for racial and socioeconomic disparities in health. He is the author of numerous articles on the subject of race and the environment. Robin Saha is Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Montana and affiliated faculty with its School of Public and Community Health Sciences. He is among the leading scholars conducting quantitative studies of environmental inequality using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). His articles appear in leading social science journals including Demography and Social Problems. His teaching and research focuses on the intersection of environmental justice, health and policy with an emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. He is committed to providing assistance to contaminated communities and works actively on tribal environmental issues. One of his current community­based research projects focuses on substandard housing and environmental health on Montana Indian reservations. He also consults on environmental justice legal cases and conducts environmental justice analyses for a wide variety of nonprofit advocacy organizations. Beverly Wright is a sociologist and the founding director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ) at Dillard University (formerly at Xavier University of Louisiana) in New Orleans. She is a leading scholar, advocate and activist in the environmental justice arena. She served on the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for the state of Louisiana and on the city of New Orleans' Select Committee for the Sewerage and Water Board. She is co­chair of the National Black Environmental Justice Network and the Environmental Justice Climate Change (EJCC) Initiative. She is the co­author of In the Wake of the Storm: Environment, Disaster and Race after Katrina (Russell Sage Foundation, May 2006). She is a native of New Orleans and a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty 1987—2007”, <http://www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/toxic20.pdf>, March 2007] SV

Despite significant improvements in environmental protection over the past several decades, millions of Americans continue to live, work, play and go to school in unsafe and unhealthy physical environments. 7 Over the past three decades, the U.S. EPA has not always recognized that many of our government and industry practices (whether intended or unintended) have adverse impacts on poor people and people of color. Discrimination is a fact of life in America. Racial discrimination is unjust, unfair and is also illegal. Nevertheless, discrimination continues to deny millions of Americans their basic civil and human rights. The EPA is mandated to enforce the nation’s environmental laws and regulations equally across the board. It is also required to protect all Americans from health threats that may result from locally undesirable land uses or LULUs—such as landfills, incinerators, chemical plants, refineries and other polluting facilities. Equity may mean different things to different people. Equity is distilled into three broad categories: procedural, geographic and social equity. Procedural equity refers to the "fairness" question: the extent that governing rules, regulations, evaluation criteria and enforcement are applied uniformly across the board and in a nondiscriminatory way. Unequal protection might result from nonscientific and undemocratic decisions, exclusionary practices, public hearings held in remote locations and at inconvenient times, and use of English­only material as the language to communicate and conduct hearings for non­English­speaking publics.

#### It’s worse now than ever—EPA’s TRI reform increases issues with toxic chemical release

**Bullard et al 7** [Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University. He is the author of thirteen books that address sustainable development, environmental racism, urban land use, industrial facility siting, community reinvestment, housing, transportation and smart growth. His book, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality (Westview Press, 2000), is a standard text in the environmental justice field. His most recent books include Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World (Earthscan/MIT Press, 2003), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity (South End Press, 2004), The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution (Sierra Club Books, 2005), Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity (MIT Press, 2007) and The Black Metropolis in the Twenty­First Century: Race, Power and the Politics of Place (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming May 2007). Paul Mohai is Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was an early and major contributor to the growing body of quantitative research examining the disproportionate environmental burdens in low­income and people of color communities. A significant outcome of this early research was the organization of the historic 1990 “Michigan Conference on Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards” with colleague Dr. Bunyan Bryant. Dr. Mohai also has been a major contributor to research examining the environmental attitudes of African Americans and their influence on the environmental movement. His current research involves national­level studies examining cause and effect relationships in the distribution of environmental hazards by race and class, including examining the role environmental factors play in accounting for racial and socioeconomic disparities in health. He is the author of numerous articles on the subject of race and the environment. Robin Saha is Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Montana and affiliated faculty with its School of Public and Community Health Sciences. He is among the leading scholars conducting quantitative studies of environmental inequality using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). His articles appear in leading social science journals including Demography and Social Problems. His teaching and research focuses on the intersection of environmental justice, health and policy with an emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. He is committed to providing assistance to contaminated communities and works actively on tribal environmental issues. One of his current community­based research projects focuses on substandard housing and environmental health on Montana Indian reservations. He also consults on environmental justice legal cases and conducts environmental justice analyses for a wide variety of nonprofit advocacy organizations. Beverly Wright is a sociologist and the founding director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ) at Dillard University (formerly at Xavier University of Louisiana) in New Orleans. She is a leading scholar, advocate and activist in the environmental justice arena. She served on the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for the state of Louisiana and on the city of New Orleans' Select Committee for the Sewerage and Water Board. She is co­chair of the National Black Environmental Justice Network and the Environmental Justice Climate Change (EJCC) Initiative. She is the co­author of In the Wake of the Storm: Environment, Disaster and Race after Katrina (Russell Sage Foundation, May 2006). She is a native of New Orleans and a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty 1987—2007”, <http://www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/toxic20.pdf>, March 2007] SV

In the Fall 2005, EPA announced plans to change the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) program. According to many environmental advocates, the new program would severely weaken the program, deny the public information and set back EPA efforts to confront the most serious public issues related to toxic chemicals. 26 In July 2006, EPA’s Science Advisory Board Committee opposed these changes in a harsh letter to EPA administrator Stephen L. Johnson. In December 2006, the EPA announced final rules that undermine this critical program by eliminating detailed reports from more than 5,000 facilities that release up to 2,000 pounds of chemicals every year; and eliminating detailed reports from nearly 2,000 facilities that manage up to 500 pounds of chemicals known to pose some of the worst threats to human health, including lead and mercury. Some of the extraneous changes include a reporting requirement of every two years (instead of the more adequate yearly reporting currently in place), raising the threshold amount required to report toxic releases, the elimination of the requirement that forced industry to report more detailed reports and the weakening of other important programs at EPA because of the lack of relevant information previously generated with TRI data. 27 Since 1987, EPA has collected and stored TRI information in a central database that is accessible on the Internet. It has been used by thousands of neighbors, journalists and local officials to evaluate the environmental performance of nearby facilities. The program is widely credited with reducing releases of program chemicals by 65 percent.

### EJ K of Science / Democratic Process Key

#### EPA Risk Assessments are flawed—bureaucrats and corporations control epistemology

**ERF 12** [Environmental Research Foundation, Independent news and resources for grassroots social change, reaches over 20000 people a year, “Risk Assessments vs. Alternatives Assessments: Who get the benefits and who get the risks? Who decides?”, <http://www.ejnet.org/ej/riskassessment.html>, Date Last Modified: 7/12/2012] SV

This whole notion of a "safe" dose of poison is outdated. Our environment is already overloaded with pollution and any additional amount is unacceptable. The entire "science" of risk assessment fails to account for the complexity of systems and tends to look at one chemical at a time and how it affects healthy adult white males with cancer deaths. It doesn't tend to account for women, children, fetuses, the elderly, those with compromised immune systems, the multiple/additive/cumulative/synergistic effects of exposure to many pollutants, or the number of people who survive cancer or suffer non-cancer effects. There is no science that can handle the complexity of dumping 90,000+ chemicals into the environment and understanding all of the impacts. In effect, risk assessment is merely a "death assessment" where bureaucrats gets to decide how much of each poison the public can acceptably be exposed to -- usually based on a standard of accepting an additional one in a million deaths from cancer for each permitted exposure to each chemical. As Dr. John Gofman once stated about nuclear power: "Nuclear power is mass, random, premeditated murder." The same could be said of most chemical exposures that are permitted by government-determined "safe" levels based on risk assessments. Rather than rely on this outdated and unscientific method to control exposure, decisions need to be made through community-based needs assessments and alternatives assessments, where the affected populations can take part in a democratic decision-making process on whether proposed pollution sources are necessary in the first place and whether there are safer alternatives that can be employed. The current risk assessment approach assumes that corporations have a right to expose the public to pollution and that it's just a matter of ensuring that they stay within certain "safe" limits. A former director of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency once said: "We should remember that risk assessment can be likened to the captured spy: if you torture it long enough, it will tell you anything you want to know"

### EJ Solvency---Institutional Focus Good

#### Addressing institutional racism is necessary---you have an individual responsibility to advocate the plan

**Gilman 6** [Nils Gilman is a high tech executive and entrepreneur in the Silicon Valley. He is the author of Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America (Johns Hopkins, 2003) and coeditor of Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War (University of Massachusetts Press, 2003). He is currently working on an intellectual biography of Peter Drucker. “What Katrina Teaches about the Meaning of Racism”, <http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Gilman/>, Jun 11, 2006] SV

To what extent was West’s statement fair? More generally, what would it mean to ascribe the racial profile of Katrina’s victims to “racism”? This essay will argue that the debate over the racial meaning of Katrina exposes a public disagreement in the United States about the meaning of racism itself. The fundamental divide in the debate over racism in the United States today is between those who regard racism as essentially a question of individual psychology versus those who consider it a social, structural phenomenon.

One of the most fundamental problems with the discussion of racism in the United States today is the tendency (most commonly found, it must be said, on the political right and among whites) to equate racism with racial prejudice. People of this persuasion define racism as being identical to (and, crucially, limited to) ethnophobia—that is, disdain for other people on the basis of their supposed racial characteristics. In this definition, racism is not a social condition but rather is something that exists in the minds of “racists.”

It is widely and correctly observed that this sort of racial prejudice, or bigotry, has abated greatly in this country in the last half century. Though racial prejudice certainly still exists, many fewer people despise others simply because of their skin color. This is true not only in terms of a reduction of the number of bigots, but also in terms of a steady restriction of the social arenas in which prejudice manifests itself. Even subtle displays of bigotry are today widely regarded as illegitimate not just in the political arena, but also at work or even in social circles. For example, while many whites may still cavil at their daughters marrying a black man, the vast majority of whites no longer actively or even passively refuse to work alongside people of color; and that someone might be refused service on public transportation because of their skin color is unimaginable. It is precisely this tabooification of active racial hatred that leads some to believe that racism is no longer a significant problem for American society.

It is impossible to overstate what huge progress the curbing of bigotry represents for the United States. But if rolling back bigotry is a necessary condition for eliminating racism, it is arguably not a sufficient condition. This is precisely the fulcrum of the political debate in this country today about racism.

The problem with equating racism with prejudice is that it fails to address the fact that racial discrimination takes place not merely through intentional (though perhaps unselfconscious) interactions between individuals, but also as a result of deep social and institutional practices and habits. That is, historical patterns of race-based exclusion do not disappear in lock-step with the diminishment of the chthonic prejudices that underpinned the original race-based exclusions. Long after white people cease to actively hate and consciously discriminate against racial minorities, there persist social patterns—where people live, which social organizations they belong to, what schools they attend, and so on—that were built during the hundreds of years where active racial prejudice was the fact of ethnic life in America. These social and institutional structures, in other words, are constructed on prejudicial racialist foundations. As such, they are bearers of the racist past, even though they may today no longer be populated by active bigots. This social and economic exclusion on the basis of race is what “racism” is really all about.

The continued exclusion of blacks from certain prestigious, purely social organizations is the archetype for this sort of racism. Consider the illustrative archetype of the all-white country club. The barrier to entry for blacks into these sorts of institutions is rarely an active rule banning blacks from joining.2 Rather, what excludes blacks is that the club members know few if any black people as social equals outside the club. Now, it would be a mistake to conclude from this lack of black friends that the club members are necessarily prejudiced against black people. Rather, the club is simply an institutional manifestation of a longstanding social network of upper-class whites. For such a social set, it’s not that they’re against the idea of socializing with blacks (though maybe their parents or grandparents were), it’s just that as a matter of fact they don’t socialize with blacks. The phrase “not caring about black people” is thus both fair and accurate to describe the mentality of this social milieu. Folks in this milieu may not be bigots, but they scarcely know any black people and thus don’t pay much mind to the specific concerns and welfare of black folks. In the meanwhile, the club facilitates the making of money (within their narrow social circle), the reproduction of the elite (within the same narrow social circle), and thus generally works to assure the social replication of the longstanding racialist pattern, all without a discriminatory thought ever entering anyone’s head.

Moreover, it should be stressed that racism can replicate itself merely via an unwillingness to challenge these racialized institutions and patterns. Undoubtedly the majority of white Americans regard themselves as post-prejudicial; yet many continue to consider the impact of racialist patterns of exclusion as something that the individual victims of those patterns must take individual responsibility for redressing.3 The result is a huge gap between blacks and whites in their understanding of the racial meaning of Katrina: for blacks, the disproportionate blackness of Katrina’s victims is a sign of how the plight of their community is systematically ignored by the government; whereas the large majority of whites consider the racial issue as more or less irrelevant.4 (A less comfortable example for the average reader of this essay might be the challenge of making “diversity hires” at elite universities: when someone on the search committee insists that there simply are no qualified minority candidates for a given position, this argument is far less likely to be the result of active prejudice than it is to derive from an unwillingness to challenge a process that at every step imposes race-tinged filters.)

It cannot be repeated often enough that racial exclusion, e.g. racism, today happens not so much through active bigotry as it does through the tacit exclusions created by these sorts of unstated, unconsidered social habits. The fundamental point is one that is deeply uncomfortable for large sectors of this country: if your social network is, for purely historical reasons, defined by color lines that were drawn long ago in a different and undeniably widely bigoted age, then you don’t have to be a bigot yourself to be perpetuating the institutional structures of racial exclusion, e.g. racism. This was exactly Illinois Senator Barack Obama’s point when he declared on the Senate floor that the poor response to Katrina was not “evidence of active malice,” but merely the result of “a continuation of passive indifference.” 5 These structural exclusions matter very much for one’s total life opportunities, including crucially one’s economic opportunities…and thus greatly affect one’s opportunities to, say, escape from deadly hurricanes.

The social definition of racism underpins the argument that while anyone can be prejudiced or bigoted toward anyone else on account of their skin color (including blacks who hate whites), racism is something that only applies to blacks and other ethnic minorities. Since racism is a matter of racially-coded social exclusion from positions of power, and since white people are not systematically so excluded, white people cannot be victims of racism. Yes, a white person can be a victim of bigotry, and a black person can be a bigot, but it is only society itself that is racist. Individuals can only meaningfully be described as “racists” insofar as their prejudices actively perpetuate society’s racism.

When two thirds of blacks believe that “racism continues to be a problem” in this country, while two thirds of whites believe that it is not, the divide in good measure can be explained by the competing understandings of what constitutes racism. To quote the Wall Street Journal’s op-ed page, “For white Americans in general…as the proportion of whites who supported or were complicit in Jim Crow segregation or other racist institutions declines…the question of race becomes less fraught with every passing year.” 6 By contrast, black people find themselves systematically outside the centers of power and privilege, and conclude that the lovely thoughts inside white people’s heads aren’t the salient issue.

### Transport Good---Civil Rights Issue

#### **Transportation equity is a key civil rights issue – federal policy key**

Quamie 12 (Lexer Quamie is a Counsel for the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, “Transportation Equity a Key to Winning Full Civil Rights”, Autumn Awakening, Vol. 18, <http://www.urbanhabitat.org/node/6701> EG)

Equity in transportation means a system that works for everyone and at many different levels. Especially in these times of high unemployment and unprecedented income inequality, transportation policy is one of the most pressing civil and human rights issues facing our nation. The choices we make with respect to federal transportation policy have an enormous impact on our economy, our health, and our climate. But these decisions about policy and funding are rarely made in consultation with, or with consideration for the low-income people who rely so heavily on public transportation. Spending programs do not benefit all populations equally and the negative impacts of some transportation decisions—historic neighborhoods dissected by freeways, stable communities disrupted, and the transit-dependent isolated from essential services through cutbacks—are broadly felt and have long-lasting effects. The unequal allocation of resources and access to affordable transportation—often along class and racial lines—has been termed by some as “transportation apartheid.” The struggle to end “transportation apartheid” is rooted in the civil rights movement and resistance to the infamous “separate but equal” doctrine encouraged by Plessy v. Ferguson. In 1953, roughly half a century after Plessy relegated “coloreds” to the back of the bus, blacks in Baton Rouge, Louisiana staged what historians believe to be the first bus boycott of the civil rights movement. Two years later, Rosa Parks’ arrest for refusing to give up her seat on a Montgomery city bus sparked the bus boycott that ignited the civil rights movement. Now, 50 years later, in spite of other significant social and economic gains, transportation still remains a crucial civil rights priority.

#### Transportation is a civil rights issue – well-targeted investment is key to solve abuses against marginalized populations

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

Transportation is a basic ingredient for quality of life indicators such as health, education, employment, economic development, access to municipal services, residential mobility, and environmental quality. Transportation continues to be a civil rights issue.2 14 Improvements in transportation investments and air quality are of special needs to low-income persons and people of color, who are concentrated in the nation's most polluted urban centers.215 Transportation investments, enhancements, and financial resources, if used properly, can bring new life and revitalization to much needed urban areas. Race and class dynamics operate to isolate many low-income and people of color central city residents from expanding suburban job centers. 216 Transportation dollars have fueled suburban highway construction and job sprawl.217 Some transportation projects have cut wide paths through low-income and people of color neighborhoods, physically isolated residents from their institutions and businesses, disrupted once-stable communities, displaced thriving businesses, contributed to urban sprawl, subsidized infrastructure decline, created traffic gridlock, and subjected residents to elevated risks from accidents, noise, spills, and explosions from vehicles carrying hazardous chemicals and other dangerous materials.2t 8 The environmental justice movement has set out clear goals of eliminating unequal enforcement of the nation's environmental, public health, housing, employment, land use, civil rights, and transportation laws.2 19 Transportation is a key ingredient in any organization's plan to build economically viable and sustainable communities. State DOTs and Metropolitan Planing Organizations ("MPO") have a major responsibility to ensure that their programs, policies, and practices do not discriminate against or adversely and disproportionately impact people of color and the poor.

#### Automobility marginalizes certain urban populations and perpetuates transportation inequity. Only a shift to public transit solves these harms.

Sanchez et al 03 (Thomas 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”. http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf)

Transportation costs are particularly burdensome for low-income households, which devote greater proportions of their incomes to transportation-related expenses than do higher-income households. In 1998, those in the lowest income quintile, making $11,943 or less, spent 36 percent of their household budget on transportation, compared with those in the highest income quintile, making $60,535 or more, who spent only 14 percent. Transportation expenditures continue to rise, reducing the amount low-income households have to spend on housing, food, health care, insurance, education, and other needs. The costs of car ownership can make it difficult to afford to purchase a home, and cars quickly depreciate compared with real property. 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. There are significant inequities between bus service, which tends to serve more low-income riders, and rail service, which tends to serve higher-income riders. These inequities pale in comparison to the differences between governmental financial and political support for highway systems and for public transit systems. Many transportation planners and policymakers, concerned primarily with the needs of suburban commuters, have focused on constructing highways and commuter rail lines that do little to serve the needs of minority and low-income communities that depend on public transportation. Examination of state transportation spending priorities reveal another inequity. A body of research suggests that states are spending more resources on transportation needs in nonmetropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas. More research examining geographically coded data on spending between cities and other areas would provide a better understanding of how transportation spending patterns impact minority and low-income communities. Transportation policies that favor highway development over public transit have several indirect negative effects. For one, such policies encourage housing development increasingly farther away from central cities, which has played an important role in fostering residential segregation and income inequalities. Also, the practice of locating major highways in minority and low-income communities has reduced housing in those areas. Other transportation investments, such as extending a rail line into a community, have made it more difficult for minorities and low-income individuals living there to afford housing because of ensuing property value increases. Individuals displaced by rising property values commonly have few alternative housing options and may end up living farther away from their jobs and social networks—a problem that is compounded by limited transportation options. Transportation policies favoring highways over transit have also helped to create “spatial mismatch”—the disconnect that occurs when new entry-level and low-skill jobs are located on the fringes of urban areas that are inaccessible to central-city residents who need those jobs. Public transportation systems operate most efficiently in densely developed urban areas and do a poor job of serving people who need to reach destinations far from the core downtown area. Transportation policies can also have indirect negative effects in the areas of health and education: Highway construction in minority and low-income communities can impair health through increased pollution, and access to education may be limited by cutbacks in school bus service with no affordable public transit as an alternative. Many transportation planners and policymakers have failed to recognize the link between transportation and land use policies and the impact of transportation policy on access to social and economic opportunities. Also, they have not recognized the need to take a regional approach in trying to address the inequitable effects of transportation policy. Federal transportation spending creates hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars worth of contracts. Although construction projects are often located in or near minority communities, minorities are generally underrepresented in the construction industry or likely concentrated in low-paying jobs. Of the more than 6.25 million people employed in construction, just 7 percent are African Americans and 17 percent are Latinos/Hispanics. Minorities represent about 28 percent of the population, but according to the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) they own only 9 percent of construction firms and receive about 5 percent of construction receipts. DOT’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program works to remedy this inequality by requiring states to allocate a portion of their federal transportation dollars to construction opportunities for small disadvantaged businesses, including those owned and operated by minorities. Inequitable transportation policy decisions are often made because minority and low-income individuals and communities are unable to learn about transit options or have little voice in transportation planning because of language barriers or lack of information. Like other obstacles to transportation accessibility, language barriers diminish social and economic opportunities by limiting a person’s ability to travel (such as by preventing a person from obtaining a drivers’ license), which is exacerbated by their inability to communicate to policymakers and planners about transportation needs. How transportation policies are decided and who is able to influence those decisions have played an important role in creating and sustaining the inequities of current transportation policies. State departments of transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations are responsible for planning transportation in a way that achieves the greatest system efficiency, mobility, and access while addressing environmental and social concerns. Although these agencies are required to seek out and consider the needs of low-income and minority households, there are no effective mechanisms to ensure their compliance with this requirement. Civil rights laws such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and environmental laws provide some legal protections for minority communities faced with discriminatory transportation policies. Enforcement of these protections, however, has been limited and should be increased. Currently there are no generally accepted measures or standards by which to gauge whether transportation planning and outcomes of transportation policies are equitable, and it is extremely difficult to enforce any requirements for equitable transportation policies. In the past decade, federal transportation policies have taken some important steps toward becoming more equitable for minority and low-income individuals and communities. Much more needs to be done, however, and the expiration of TEA-21 provides an opportunity for action. Implementation of the following recommendations would significantly support moving to equity: Increase funding for public transit and develop new programs and support existing ones that improve minority and low-income individuals’ mobility. Establish enforceable standards to measure whether the benefits and burdens of transportation policies are distributed equitably to minority and low-income communities. Increase funding for research that examines transportation equity, and improve data collection— including by collecting geographically coded data—to provide a better basis for evaluating the effects of transportation policies. Increase funding for enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the National Environmental Policy Act, and improve efforts to enforce them. Recognize the interaction between transportation, land use, and social equity, and support programs that address these effects. Transportation plays a vital role in our society. In fact, the Supreme Court recognized that the right to travel is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.1 Given the important role of transportation, it would be expected that policymakers would battle over transportation policy. Too often, however, those battles are fought over what specific projects will be funded and in which states or congressional districts, and scant attention is paid to the larger social and economic effects of transportation policies. The civil rights movement provides some evidence of the social importance of transportation to people of color. In 1955, the arrest of Rosa Parks for refusing to give her seat on a bus to a white rider sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Freedom Riders faced violent attacks to assert the rights of African Americans to ride on integrated buses traveling interstate. Many past and current transportation policies have limited the life chances of minorities by preventing access to places and opportunities. The expiration in 2003 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) provides an opportunity to address some of the inequitable effects that transportation policies have on minority and low-income communities. Americans have become increasingly mobile and more reliant on automobiles to meet their travel needs due largely to transportation policies adopted after World War II that emphasized highway development over public transportation. According to Census 2000 data, less than five percent of trips to work in urban areas were made by public transit, but this varies significantly by race and location.2 Minorities, however, are less likely to own cars than whites and are more often dependent on public transportation. The “transit-dependent” must often rely on public transportation not only to travel to work, but also to get to school, obtain medical care, attend religious services, and shop for basic necessities such as groceries. The transit-dependent commonly have low incomes and thus, in addition to facing more difficulties getting around, they face economic inequities as a result of transportation policies oriented toward travel by car. Surface transportation policies at the local, regional, state, and national levels have a direct impact on urban land use and development patterns. The types of transportation facilities and services in which public funds are invested provide varying levels of access to meet basic social and economic needs. The way communities develop land dictates the need for certain types of transportation, and on the other hand, the transportation options in which communities invest influence patterns of urban development. While many lament the trend toward “suburban sprawl” as unaesthetic or damaging to the environment, those who support social equity should also be concerned about this trend. Substantial investment in highway development and other transportation programs that encourage private automobile use has encouraged and supported low-density developments that extend increasingly farther and farther from the central city and to residential and commercial areas that are increasingly spread out—edgeless cities.3 In addition to being costly to state and local governments,4 transportation policies that encourage these growth patterns play a substantial role in producing some indirect, negative social and economic effects, including perpetuating residential segregation and exacerbating the inability of minorities to access entry level employment, which is increasingly found in suburban areas.5 This report reviews existing data and research regarding the economic and social effects of transportation policies. While the data suggest that these policies have inequitable effects on minority and low-income communities, more research is necessary to further understand the effects of transportation policies on minorities, particularly those living in the suburbs. We first provide historical background and demographic context for the remainder of the report. Next, we examine existing data about the costs of transportation and how these costs combined with current transportation policy priorities have inequitable effects on low-income minorities. We then identify indirect inequitable economic and social effects of surface transportation policies on minorities and examine existing research in this area. These indirect effects include inequitable access to employment and housing, and education and health disparities. The report then delves into the issue of unequal access to opportunities for construction jobs and contracts created by federal transportation programs. We next focus on the role of language barriers in access to transportation and participation in the transportation planning process, and examine the issue of minority participation in transportation planning processes. Following discussion of enforcement of civil rights and environmental laws, we close with policy recommendations and conclusions. Efforts to improve the fairness of transportation policies must first recognize the complexities and wide impact of those policies on civil rights, mobility, land use, and the environment. These efforts must also include setting easily enforceable standards to measure whether the benefits and burdens of transportation policies are distributed equitably to minority and low-income communities.6 Transportation researchers and scholars are increasingly recognizing the importance of social equity, largely due to the successful efforts of grassroots organizations to draw attention to the unfairness of transportation policies. An executive committee member of The National Academies’ Transportation Research Board predicted in 1999 that “[e]quity will be one of the major themes in transportation policy for the coming decade,” and called for more analysis and discussion of the distribution of costs and benefits of transportation projects to minority communities.7 The environmental justice movement has add The environmental justice movement has addressed some of the inequitable effects of transportation polices on racial minorities and brought attention to the issue of transportation equity. Environmental justice efforts, however, have primarily drawn attention to governmental policies that negatively and inequitably affect the natural environment in areas with concentrated minority populations (and consequently negative health effects).8 Historically, transportation equity has been largely ignored by the vast majority of transportation planners and researchers. Transportation policy inequities should be addressed both through environmental justice efforts and through traditional transportation analyses about access and mobility. We hope that this report, by further defining the issues, will compel policymakers, researchers, and administrators who work on transportation policies to recognize the critical need to support transportation equity as part of their work. Transportation issues have been central to the civil rights movement from its inception, in ways both symbolic and systemic. In 1892, Homer A. Plessy, an African American, attempted to sit in the whites-only section of a segregated railway car. The Supreme Court, in its infamous *Plessy v. Ferguson*9 decision, created the separate-but-equal doctrine and held constitutional the state statute that required different races to use different railway cars.10 During the civil rights movement of the 1960s, much of the discussion about transportation issues for minority and low-income persons revolved around land use patterns and the social and economic conditions of urban areas. Shortly following the civil unrest in Los Angeles in 1965, the California governor appointed a commission chaired by John McCone (McCone Commission) to examine the causes of the unrest. The McCone Commission identified “inadequate and costly” transportation as contributing to high rates of unemployment among the black urban population.11 In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (commonly known as the Kerner Commission) released its report on the causes and effects of riots in U.S. cities. Among its recommendations for enhanced employment opportunities for central-city residents was the creation of improved transportation links between ghetto neighborhoods and new job locations in the suburbs.12 In 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., described how city planning decisions result in transportation systems that underserve minority communities: “Urban transit systems in most American cities . . . have become a genuine civil rights issue—and a valid one—because the layout of rapid-transit systems determines the accessibility of jobs to the African-American community. If transportation systems in American cities could be laid out so as to provide an opportunity for poor people to get meaningful employment, then they could begin to move into the mainstream of American life.”13 Post–World War II surface transportation policies were not favorable to minority and low-income communities. Many older residents of such communities across the country clearly remember the impact that new major highway construction had on their neighborhoods. Generally, federal and state agencies sited highway projects in low-income communities, typically using the rationale that property values were lower. Because of this practice, a great deal of resentment developed in minority and low-income communities toward highway construction that began in the 1950s and 1960s as part of “slum clearance” and “urban renewal” strategies and displaced or physically divided entire communities. These types of highway construction projects occurred during a time when federal transportation “policy” did little more than allocate large amounts of money to build interstate highways. Two case studies highlight the experiences of predominantly minority communities that fought efforts to build highways through their neighborhoods. Both communities were forced to resort to legal action because residents’ concerns were not heeded by transportation planners and agencies. Hamtramck, Michigan, a city within a city—it is almost entirely surrounded by the city of Detroit—now promotes itself as a diverse community, but from 1959 to 1965 approximately 1,800 African-American families were displaced from their homes as part of various urban renewal and revitalization strategies.14 In 1959, 600 African-American Hamtramck families were removed to make room for a parking lot; several years later, another 1,200 families, mostly African Americans, were moved to make room for Interstate 75. The freeway isolated the Grand Haven–Dyar neighborhood, which was primarily African American, cutting it off from the rest of Hamtramck, including schools, churches, shops, restaurants, and other amenities. In 1971, a U.S. District Court judge ruled against Hamtramck in a class-action case challenging the city’s transportation decisions as discriminatory displacement. The judge’s ruling described the city’s action as “Negro Removal.” In late 2002, the Hamtramck City Council finally settled the 30-year old civil rights lawsuit, and plans are under way to build replacement homes for many of the families displaced by the interstate highway.15 In James City, North Carolina, several major transportation projects had already been built in or near the almost 100 percent African-American community that disrupted its economic and community life when the Neuse River Bridge project was proposed. 16 U.S. highway 70, built in the 1970s, literally paved over a historic cemetery that was important to the James City community. In the early 1990s, an airport runway expansion project forced the condemnation of homes and damaged other historic cemeteries of local importance. Advocacy and legal efforts halted plans to run the Neuse River Bridge project, a massive highway bridge and interchange system, right through the center of James City. Eventually, however, the project was sited in another part of the city.17 The experiences of Hamtramck and James City are not unique. Dozens of communities across the nation were treated similarly as highways were built through and near them. Residents point to highway construction in cities as diverse as Los Angeles; Memphis, Tennessee; New Orleans; Canton, Ohio; and New York City as a significant contributor to economic and neighborhood blight in previously stable low-income and minority communities. During the 1970s and 1980s, no significant federal efforts were directed toward ensuring transportation equity,18 and displacement of minorities and destruction of minority communities because of highway construction continued. During this period, however, federal support for public transportation increased, which indirectly benefited low-income, racial minorities through the development and expansion of urban transit systems. These benefits were limited because the amounts invested in public transportation were dwarfed by amounts invested in building highways. Federal transportation funding went directly to state departments of transportation, which had sole discretion to decide which projects to fund. Federal policy heavily encouraged states to spend on highways by making highway projects eligible for the highest level of federal matching funds—four dollars in federal funding for every dollar the state contributed.19 The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was the first major federal transportation policy to give any consideration to the health, economic, and social effects of transportation policy on racial minority and low-income communities. Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low- Income Populations,”20 issued in 1994, went even further by clarifying that federal agencies must identify and address any “disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects” on minority and low-income populations in all of their programs, policies, and activities. ISTEA,21 enacted by Congress in 1991, addressed a number of the most significant flaws in previous transportation funding policies. ISTEA included clear (if easy-to-evade) requirements for public participation in transportation planning and provided for some local control of the allocation of federal transportation money. The new law represented a dramatic departure from the previous system of transportation planning; one congressperson noted several years after its passage that ISTEA “…was not simply a highway bill, or even a highway and transit bill. Instead, it restructured the entire process by which we planned and carried out surface transportation improvements in the United States.”22 One of the more noteworthy changes was that ISTEA made Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) primarily responsible for planning and allocating transportation funding in metropolitan areas by giving funds directly to them.23 Although MPOs had been in existence since the 1950s, generally operating either as a subdivision of the state department of transportation or as a function of a regional council of governments, ISTEA and the U.S. Department of Transportation’s (DOT’s) implementing regulations made them more influential and gave them uniform functions and responsibilities.24 ISTEA also broadened the membership of the policy-setting boards of MPOs governing large areas, requiring that they include representatives from local governments in the region, agencies operating major transportation systems, and state officials.25 ISTEA and its implementing regulations required MPOs and state planning agencies to develop 20-year regional plans outlining in detail the priorities, policies, and strategies for the region’s transportation system.26 MPOs were also required to prepare, with community involvement, a Transportation Improvement Program listing the transportation projects that would be undertaken in the next three years.27 In addition, ISTEA made a number of changes that addressed the allocation of federal funding. Most important, mass transit was given the same federal funding match as highways, thus taking a step toward eliminating the clear policy preference for highway spending. In 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, which directed federal agencies to incorporate achieving environmental justice as part of their missions. As a result of this order, transportation agencies issued guidance for incorporating environmental justice principles into existing programs, policies, and activities. DOT’s order on environmental justice indicates that President Clinton’s executive order was intended to encompass social and economic effects interrelated to adverse human health and environmental effects.28 When ISTEA expired in 1998, Congress passed TEA-21,29 which currently governs federal funding of surface transportation systems. This act is one of the major tools through which transportation planning and implementation can be made more responsive to equity and environmental justice concerns.30 With a $217 billion spending allocation for transportation projects over a six-year period (1998–2003 inclusive),31 TEA-21 has been called “the largest public works bill enacted in the nation’s history.”32 TEA-21 retains the general decision-making structure and planning process that ISTEA created for distributing federal transportation spending to states and metropolitan areas.33 TEA- 21, however, significantly strengthened the opportunities for public involvement and required greater responsiveness to the concerns of minority and low-income communities in the transportation planning process. Other objectives of TEA-21 focus on improving low-income persons’ transportation mobility levels by ensuring that public transportation provided through different modes and by different agencies are coordinated to ensure “connections between people and jobs, goods and markets, and neighborhoods.”34 TEA-21 also established grant programs to help serve the transportation needs of minority and low-income communities. For example, it authorized the Job Access and Reverse Commute grant programs, which provide federal funds to states, local governments, local transit agencies, and nonprofit organizations. Job Access grants were intended to provide new or expanded transportation services to help welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals get to jobs and employment-related services (education, training, child care, etc.). Reverse Commute grants were designed to transport individuals to suburban employment centers from urban, rural, and other suburban locations. TEA-21 also established the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program, which supports local activities to help better integrate land use and transportation planning. Some other federal laws that are not primarily concerned with transportation have provisions addressing some aspect of transportation equity. For example, the welfare reform act—formally known as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996—was intended to move people off public assistance to some form of employment.35 Federal policymakers, recognizing in 1997 that most households in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program created by the new welfare law had limited transportation mobility, funded a welfare-to-work grant program that could be used for transportation assistance. For fiscal years 1998 and 1999, $3 billion was allocated to states to address mobility needs.36 The current effect of surface transportation policies on minority and low-income communities can best be understoood in the context of general demographic facts that show how transportation, race, poverty, and geography intersect. The 2000 census provided tremendous amounts of new demographic information that map changes in the American population and the characteristics of its minority population over the past decade. Analysis of the census data shows persistent disparities between whites and people of color. Where people live can greatly affect what types of transportation options are available to them to travel to work and to carry out their daily activities. Although America’s population is approximately 69 percent White, 12 percent African American, 12.5 percent Latino, and 3.6 percent Asian American,37 the composition of major U.S. cities and urban areas is quite different. Since 1960, people of color have increasingly populated metropolitan areas.38 Only 52 of the 100 largest cities have a majority white population, according to 2000 census data.39 The 100 largest cities generally saw an increase in Latinos, Asian Americans, and African Americans and a decrease in whites, with the Latino population growing the most rapidly.40 (See Table 1.) Metropolitan areas, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, have increased in population since 1910, but suburban growth has accounted for most of these increases.41 By 2000, half of all Americans lived in the suburbs.42 Although more minorities are living in the suburbs than in 1990, whites still have the highest percentage of any racial group living in the suburbs (71%).43 In the top 102 most populous metropolitan areas, minorities comprised only 27 percent of suburban populations.44 As these facts about the populations of cities and suburbs suggest, residential segregation continues to persist. On average, African Americans, Latinos, and whites live in neighborhoods with people primarily of the same race.45 Over the past 20 years, however, overall racial segregation levels have declined across U.S. metropolitan areas.46 One report examining five different indicators of metropolitan residential segregation found that overall residential segregation declined between 4 and 11 percent between 1980 and 2000.47 From 1980 to 1990 the overall rate of change was approximately 3.8 percent, while from 1990 to 2000 it was 3.4 percent—suggesting that racial integration slowed during the 1990s compared with the 1980s. These modest changes are shown in Figure 1. Generally, since 1980, Latino–white and Asian– white segregation levels have remained approximately the same.48 Black–white segregation remains significantly higher than the levels of segregation for other minority groups.49 Trends in residential segregation also vary by region, metropolitan size, and racial composition. It is unclear whether integration is occurring generally for racial minorities or whether it is isolated to more mobile, middle-class households. While these general trends suggest that residential segregation is decreasing somewhat in metropolitan areas, the unequal distribution of metropolitan household incomes has not made a corresponding improvement. For example, the neighborhood income gap for African Americans and whites increased in absolute and percentage terms in 40 of the 50 largest metros.50 In fact, research shows that the level of income inequality in the United States is increasing and that the United States ranks at the bottom in income equality compared with other industrialized countries.51 Trends at the national level are symptomatic of income distribution disparities at the state, regional, and local levels and have far-reaching social and economic implications.52 Disparities in poverty levels between whites and minorities remain, even though these levels are low for all groups compared with levels found by previous surveys. In 2001, whites had a poverty rate of approximately 8 percent compared with 23 percent for African Americans, 21 percent for Latinos,53 and 10 percent for Asian Americans.54 Consistent with these figures are the facts that generally: 1) The poverty rate in cities is almost double the suburban rate, 2) cities have significantly higher unemployment rates than the suburbs, and 3) there is an income gap between those living in the cities and in the suburbs.55 Household wealth—or assets minus debts—differs significantly by race as well. In 1995, the median household wealth was $40,200.56 For non-Hispanic white households, the median wealth was $49,030. For African-American households it was only $7,073, and for Latino households it was $7,255. For those in the bottom 20 percent, the median wealth by race was $9,700 for non-Hispanic white households, $1,500 for African-American households, and $1,300 for Latino households. Forty-four percent of the wealth in the United States was invested in homes and 8 percent was in motor vehicles. The median value of homes owned was $50,000 and the median value of motor vehicles was $6,675. The section “Transportation Costs and Inequities” discusses the implications of transportation costs and car ownership for wealth accumulation. People’s income levels generally correspond with their ability to own a car and the type of transportation they use. The vast majority of Americans rely on cars to meet their transportation needs, but minorities have significantly higher rates of lacking cars. Only 7 percent of white households own no cars.57 However, 24 percent of African-American households, 17 percent of Latino households, and 13 percent of Asian-American households own no cars.58 In part, because people of color have higher poverty rates, they also have higher rates of using public transportation59 to travel to work. Only 3 percent of whites rely on public transportation to get to work compared with 12 percent of African Americans, 9 percent of Latinos, and 10 percent of Asian Americans (see Figure 2).60 In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos together comprise 54 percent of public transportation users (62 percent of all bus riders, 35 percent of all subway riders, and 29 percent of all commuter rail riders.)61 Before examining the specific economic and social effects of transportation policies on minority and low-income communities, it is necessary to define transportation equity. While most transportation planners are concerned primarily with the efficiency and cost of transportation, including people’s mobility levels and the accessibility of transportation to the most people, those concerned about transportation equity seek fairness in mobility and accessibility levels across race, class, gender, and disability. The ultimate objective of transportation equity is to provide equal access to social and economic opportunity by providing equitable levels of access to all places. In the United States, concern about providing equal access to social and economic opportunity has mostly centered around an issue first identified by John Kain (1968) that is now commonly referred to as the “spatial mismatch hypothesis.” Spatial mismatch refers to the disconnect between the locations of housing and jobs suitable for lower-income people. In other words, those who most need entry-level jobs (primarily people of color) generally live in central cities while entry-level jobs are mostly in suburban locations that are not easily accessible from central cities. In England, however, policymakers and advocates often take a broader view of social inequity. The British effort to combat “social exclusion” is a more wide-ranging approach than the American battle against spatial mismatch.62 Efforts to eradicate social exclusion address communities that are isolated from or marginalized by general society. The English government defines social exclusion as “a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown.”63 Instead of directly addressing spatial equity questions through housing and land use policies that would improve housing affordability, discourage sprawling development, and improve enforcement of housing discrimination laws, U.S. policymakers have directed significant attention to overcoming the combined problem of residential segregation and limited employment accessibility for low-income persons by improving their transportation mobility. Federal policies fail to directly address the more fundamental issue of “access and participation” on a broad scale. In the United States, attempts to counter spatial inequity are usually limited to improving housing and employment access—represented in some respects by residential segregation—whereas *social exclusion* is a much broader concept. It encompasses concerns about 1) physical (personal) exclusion, 2) geographic exclusion, 3) exclusion from facilities, 4) economic exclusion, 5) temporal exclusion, 6) fear-based exclusion, and 7) space exclusion. Addressing social exclusion includes addressing problems such as lack of access to jobs, education, and training; low levels of access to public transportation at particular times of the day, which has an impact on persons without cars working late and early-morning shifts; and limited access to public and private spaces because of unsafe conditions and design.64 Transportation equity is a similarly broad concept. The importance of transportation policies and their inequitable effect on minority and low-income communities by limiting access to social and economic opportunities must be understood in this broader context. 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.69 Policies 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.70 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.73 The emphasis on highway and road construction in federal and state policy shifts resources away from public transportation options for low-income families. According to survey results released by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) in November 2002, more than 50 percent of the transit agencies that responded to the survey had implemented, or were planning to implement, fare increases (almost 90 percent of the large systems), and 34 percent said they were cutting back on transit service.74 These fare increases and service cuts are being driven primarily by municipal, county, state, and transit agency budget crises brought on by the nation’s economic slump.75 Those who are dependent on public transportation often have difficulty meeting fare increases. Although more research is needed in this area, it is likely that because people of color are disproportionately poor and have higher rates of using public transportation, fare increases create a greater economic burden on minorities. An APTA report in 1992 found that nationwide, on average, users of public transportation are 45 percent white, 31 percent African American, and 18 percent Latino/Hispanic (see Figure 4) even though their general populations are approximately 69 percent, 12 percent, and 12.5 percent, respectively.76 Public transportation users also tend to have lower incomes. Nationally, approximately 38 percent of transit users have incomes of $20,000 or less, while 41 percent have incomes between $20,000 and $75,000. Only 21.5 percent have incomes above $75,000.77 APTA research and other sources suggest that fare increases can have very negative consequences for transit agencies.78 As fares go up, ridership tends to fall. These trends also tend to be more pronounced in smaller population centers. By increasing fares, public transit agencies run the risk of losing ridership, particularly riders with other transportation options. Those that remain—riders who lack other options—bear the burden of higher fares and service cutbacks that may result from ridership decline, which may severely impact their economic livelihoods and ability to access basic services.79 Little research examines the impact of fare reductions on transit agencies and ridership. One expert found that reducing fares can dramatically increase ridership.80 More research in this area would provide a clearer understanding of the effect of fare increases on minority and low-income populations. Research also suggests that low-income riders of transportation tend to subsidize their higher-income counterparts for a couple of reasons. First, fare structures are often designed in such a way that short trips subsidize longer trips, and low-income and central-city riders generally make short trips compared with higher-income suburban users who make long trips.81 One researcher noted that a user who travels one mile pays more than twice the true cost of the trip, whereas a user who travels 20 miles pays only 20 percent of the cost.82 Second, the amount of revenue gained from passenger fares, including passes, tends to be higher on central-city transit routes than suburban routes, and more low-income transit riders tend to make trips on central-city routes.83 The most egregious example of this subsidization can be seen by comparing bus and rail service.84 Data from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey show that in urban areas, households earning less than $20,000 comprised 47 percent of bus riders, 20 percent of subway riders, and 6 percent of commuter rail riders.85 Households earning $100,000 or more comprised 42 percent of commuter rail riders, 27 percent of subway riders, and only 7 percent of bus riders.86 Clearly, more individuals with low incomes rely on bus service and more high-income individuals rely on rail service (see Figure 5). Bus transit receives only 31 percent of the capital funds spent nationwide for transit, although it carries more than 60 percent of the trips.87 This disparity is exacerbated by requirements that federal funding for transit generally must be used only for capital expenditures, not operating expenses. Because rail transit is capital-intensive and bus transit is labor-intensive, a greater emphasis on capital subsidies favors rail service over bus service, and consequently generally favors higher-income over lower-income riders. Although we are not aware of any studies documenting the disparities in funding spent on bus compared with rail transit in specific cities, Los Angeles is one example of a city that engaged in this type of disparate funding. Community activists and attorneys alleged in a lawsuit88 in the early 1990s that the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LAMTA) spent only 30 percent of its resources on bus transit, even though almost 94 percent of its riders used the buses and 80 percent of them were people of color. Seventy percent of LAMTA’s resources went to rail, even though only 6 percent of its riders used rail. Rail riders were primarily white.89 The gulf between governmental financial and political support for rail compared with bus service, however, is not nearly as great as that for highway systems compared with public transit systems. The negative consequences of funding policies that favor spending on highways over transit are exacerbated because MPOs, which have a better understanding of the transportation needs of metropolitan areas where many minorities and low-income individuals reside, and would be more likely to invest in public transit, only receive a small percentage of federal funds. Currently, MPOs have direct control over only 6 percent of federal transportation funds. This distribution formula discourages establishment of integrated transportation and land use policies. Although states have the ability to provide more funding to local transportation agencies, few states actually do. One notable exception is California, which gives 75 percent of its federal and state transportation program funds to regional and metropolitan transportation agencies. These local agencies have pioneered innovative programs such as providing incentives to develop denser housing within walking distance of mass transit. Increased funding for MPOs would potentially allow them to make major multimodal investments that address air quality, traffic congestion, and other priority concerns of their specific communities.90 Although most of the nation’s population is located in metropolitan areas, generates substantial revenues for highway spending, and has significant transportation infrastructure needs, there is research evidence that states spend more on serving transportation needs in nonmetropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas.91 A recent study of transportation spending in Ohio found that while urban counties generated more local revenues for highway spending than other areas, there was not a corresponding high level of spending in urban areas.92 Studies examining metropolitan areas and counties are informative. An analysis of per capita spending between cities and other areas, however, would provide us with a better understanding of how transportation funds are being spent.93 This type of analysis is difficult to perform because DOT data94 on how federal transportation funds are spent are provided only on a county-level basis, and county boundaries do not always coincide with city limits. In Maryland, however, county boundaries coincide with the city of Baltimore boundaries. Thus, it is possible to determine the per capita distribution of funding by county and determine how funding for Baltimore ranks relative to other counties. An unpublished analysis by the Surface Transportation Policy Project shows that Baltimore receives the lowest federal highway funding per capita in the state—$121 per person—showing a clear preference in funding for suburban and rural counties (see Figure 6).95 Interestingly, the distribution of this $121 per person is fairly even, with the largest amount spent on bridge repair, and a significant portion directed to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit, and road repair. More of this type of analysis and analysis of spending on other types of transportation is necessary to provide a better understanding of whether inequitable patterns of transportation spending exist. This type of analysis can only be performed if more data is collected that is geographically coded and consists of geographic units smaller than counties. It is also difficult to analyze whether there are any funding disparities between minority communities and nonminority communities for the same reason—the DOT data are only available for counties. The previous section examined the *direct* effects of transportation policies on low-income minorities’ finances and their ability simply to get around. This section examines the indirect effects of transportation policies. One of the central indirect effects is the reinforcement of residential segregation. The form that we currently think of as “the city” is a product of both land use and transportation investment decisions. Highway investments in combination with federal housing and lending policies leading to post–World War II suburbanization played a significant role in “white flight” from central cities to suburbs, which had a profound impact in defining urban form and racial segregation patterns.96 Highway investment encourages the development of suburbs located increasingly farther away from central cities and has played an important role in fostering residential segregation patterns and income inequalities.97 Inequitable or inefficient land use patterns such as those resulting in residential segregation often are reinforced by policies, such as transportation investment decisions, that were established several decades ago. As many researchers have documented, residential segregation greatly influences minorities’ access to housing, education, and economic opportunities.98 More research, however, needs to be performed examining the relationship between transportation policies and residential segregation and how it should be addressed. Of all the issues in transportation equity, the perceived spatial mismatch between the residential location of low-income, urban (and often minority) households and the location of low-skill jobs has received the most attention in the academic literature.99

**Intentional government funding and maintenance decisions cause the continued segregation of populations and environmental impacts…**

Kuswa, 2k2 (Kevin, Director of Debate at U. of Richmond, “Suburbification, Segregation, and the Consolidation of the Highway Machine”, The Journal of Law in Society, 31.1, Lexis)

For every idyllic suburban community, countless blocks of city residents were losing access to clean air and water, quality public education, and affordable land or transportation. Gordon does not use the terminology of race very frequently, but he often engages in containing discourse, positioning the city as the focal point of racing and placing populations. An indispensable and primary link between Mitchell Gordon's dystopia and the notion of containment has to be the full-scale construction of urban highways. Urban highways must be mapped as physical and discursive arteries of containment, especially as they helped to construct suburbs that compounded and fostered other signs of sick and diseased cities in the 1960s. Highways made suburban housing available on one end while destroying urban housing on the other. Housing policy and transportation policy represent some of the ways institutions have perfected practices that discriminate against groups based on race. The racist effects of the highway, the city, and the suburb cannot be overlooked because of a fear of ideological criticism or identity politics. Intersectional and interlocking arrangements of oppression warrant criticism from as many directions as possible, including both depth and breadth. By firming up the genealogy of the racist manifestations of the highway machine in conjunction with the place of the suburb and the practices of state-regulated housing, it becomes clear that critical whiteness is one crucial way to map the highway machine in this country. One place of racism generated by suburbs and urban highways is the "black ghetto." Often cited as a reason for fleeing the city by industries and white middle- class suburbanites, the black ghetto is about more than stereotypes and discrimination. The black ghetto became the territory that was contained by articulations between suburban growth, highway construction, and new housing opportunities for many white [\*48] families. According to Massey and Denton: "The black ghetto was constructed through a series of well-defined institutional practices, private behaviors, and public policies by which whites sought to contain growing urban black populations." n42 Instead of describing the extensive examples of racism within American society in a bipolar way, a map of a particular arrangement of domination makes criticism possible and more pertinent. Showing how the highway machine and housing policy contributed to the oppression of non-whites demonstrates how institutions can further racist goals with tacit consent by the white majority. In Paul Fotsch's writing on urban transportation forms, he argues the link between freeways and housing segregation. n43 According to Fotsch, race infuses these issues. And the details of how institutional racism governs many of the effects of highways and suburbia is the key. This memory needs resurrecting. n44 Connecting the alignment between the highway machine and housing segregation to the alignment between land development and modes of transportation generates a line between institutional advancement and segregation. Combined with the flow of resources being used to construct highways, changes in demography and housing patterns manifested themselves in the oppressive deployment of white privilege. Urban and suburban landscapes were polarizing, particularly on race and class lines. Through the 1960s and early 1970s in America, the map of spatial segregation continued to overwhelm many urban and suburban regions. Deploying the Gramscian tropes of maneuverability and consolidation, Fotsch speaks of a "hegemonic bloc" that works to align "large capital interests" with the "white working and middle class" to create a topdown coalition. n45 The components of this bloc include road- user coalitions, truckers, steel workers, oil and gas industries, rubber [\*49] manufacturers, hotel and restaurant chains. Fotsch's standpoint provides a valuable back-drop to the exploitation left in the wake of the highway's purposeful organization of spaces and places. Notice how the trope of security takes on racial dimensions as the city is conflated with "poor people of colour:" Significant to enabling this coalition was the postwar subsidization of the suburban white life-style, including the construction of interstate freeways. The other side of white suburban security was the entrenchment of poor people of colour in central cities, and....the role freeway construction played in this entrenchment. Freeway and suburban segregation also creates the distancing which allows the distorted narrative of the inner city described in the first section to become widely accepted. n46 Fotsch initially contends "the freeway is part of dominant narratives which view African-American and Latino residents of the central city as largely responsible for the conditions of poverty and violence amidst which they live." n47 The pincer movement occurs when the urban highway materializes the stratification of groups based on race and class. The rhetoric of blame-creating a status of victim by arguing that certain people deserve their immobility-is complemented by a highway machine that allows an extreme differentiation between living conditions within a limited region. It becomes natural to blame people for inadequate living conditions in order to justify inaction. Fotsch concentrates on Los Angeles and urban California, but the same process marks the history of Houston, Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit and many other east coast cities. Charting the way interstate throughways divided Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Richmond, and Atlanta is but one string of examples. During the 1950s the "auto freeway transportation system...helped to create the ghettos," n48 [\*50] and now those same highways have joined a technological narrative that helps to legitimate the ghettos. The state continues to invade the formation of the suburb and the urban fringe by allocating resources in selective ways. State policies attempt to capture transportation and residential planning, simultaneously entrenching certain racist practices. Urban highways after 1956, in particular, were constructed according to fairly uniform standards set up by the Bureau of Public Roads in the Yellow Book. The urban highway is, simply, a wide path of limited access roadway, usually raised with at least two lanes available in each direction. The effects of these highways are severe and physical, especially their "connection to the suburban goal of escaping urban populations." n49 More pernicious than the urge to escape, the connection to suburbia made it easy to label urban populations as "poor" and "radical" and constitutive of a culture of new immigrants. n50 The logic of the suburbs implied that the run-down areas of a city were regions occupied by minorities. In instances where the actual suburb was not predominantly inhabited by whites, those places still tended to be racially homogenous and the suburb was always a means of separating economic classes. The city polarized into a few high rent districts and a number of highly populated low rent districts. The highway generated an explicitly racist boundary by isolating large numbers of people from one another. Certainly buses and consumer spots at highway exits offered locations for human contact, but not the same type of human interchange that previously occurred on trains. The place of the highway displaced residents through isolation, while simultaneously displacing urban communities by racing and subordinating certain populations. All this was done in addition to the highway's absorption of a vast amount of already limited land. Thus, the suburb carries along with it a distancing of its occupants-a distancing generated by the individualized nature of urban freeways. The distance between people justified itself by demonizing the congestion of the city, associating that congestion with poverty and [\*51] violence and essentializing minority populations as dangerous. The suburbs constructed the city as inherently violent, an unpredictable instability that could not "be contained on public transit." n51 The urban freeway permitted selective access to city resources for suburbanites, but also put up an arbitrary shield between the productive output of the highway and the violent residents of surrounding neighborhoods. Compared to subways, trains, buses, and other mass transit, the freeway shaped "a particular distracted experience of everyday life" and became "a symbol of isolation and isolatability." n52 Car-jackings, drive-by shootings, and high-speed chases all add risks to the highway cocoon, but urban freeways still stretch endlessly into the suburbs, promising the security and luxury of home (for some) at a comfortable distance from the city. Demonizing minority communities as poor and violent simultaneously charts the suburb as white and wealthy. The highway machine has directly assisted in, and perhaps even been constitutive of, a segregated metropolis. Fotsch argues that from the beginning of the 1900s, the suburb has drained the city of its life and marginalized the city's radiant diversity. Suburban residents continued to enter the central city even though they no longer paid taxes to urban governments, draining it of its resources and contributing less and less to its maintenance. The highway facilitated this siphoning, placing a suction cup over the vitality of the city's core. Fotsch also points out that these effects of the suburb were based on race as well as income: "As southern blacks began to migrate to northern and western cities during and after the First World War," isolationist whites diverted their capital to nearby suburbs. n53 Race intensified as a factor when the economy expanded after World War II and large numbers of white Americans were able to take advantage of a conjunction between suburban highways and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Catapulted by two decades of restrictive [\*52] covenants that prohibited renting or selling property to blacks in certain neighborhoods, the FHA was able to continue practices of overt discrimination. A disciplinary array of containment mechanisms collected themselves within housing, transportation, and public expenditures. Less than equal provisions were allocated to low-income and minority zones, districts, quadrants, or any other complex descriptor for the various "wrong" sides of the track. The racial grids for dwelling acted to capture human territories and integrate multiple forms of exclusion into an apparatus of geographic privilege. Since its inception in 1934, the Federal Housing Administration began granting long-term amortized mortgages for the purchasing of homes. These loans were federally insured and were generally granted "for home purchases in the suburbs" which were already being subsidized by federal spending on urban highways. n54 The FHA also rejected loans in minority areas even though the Supreme Court struck down racial covenants in 1948. n55 Well into the 60s, "FHA policy and overt discrimination on the part of banks and real estate agents helped keep suburbs exclusively white." n56 Citing a comprehensive study of the making of the underclass in the United States, Fotsch reports that the Fair Housing Act of 1968 n57 prohibited housing discrimination. Massey and Denton are quick to note that the de jure prohibition of discrimination did not translate into de facto equality. Making discrimination illegal, as in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, n58 did not reverse institutional and structural racism. If anything, the Department of Housing and Urban Development was simply a mask on top of pernicious racism. n59 Indeed, the FHA was never given the [\*53] legal authority to prosecute (or even investigate) discrimination. Massey and Denton assert that because of the weak detection powers of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, realtors and banks continued to block attempts by minorities to buy property in white suburbs. n60 It is here where Fotsch's historical narrative of housing discrimination crosses paths with the highway machine and the Interstate Highway Act of 1956. This juxtaposition marks a racist consolidation of interests and arrangements. If nothing else, the energy and social mobilization of the 1960s was a cumulative reaction to forms of segregation approaching pre-Civil War extremes. Geographic constrictions on property ownership and residency, not to mention the limited access of highways, played (and play) immense roles in physical banishment and racial oppression in America. Most discussions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act omit a direct consideration of racism and possible racist deployments of highways and suburbs. Gleaning perspective from these varied histories, it is important to add considerations of race to any map of the suburbs. The middle-class whites of the suburbs were able to increase their living standards by enjoying consumer spending fueled by equity in their homes and the deduction of property taxes from their income taxes. Housing and highways intertwined to perpetuate white privilege. When urban renewal projects did take place, they encouraged gentrification and high-rent commercial development. In some instances, the city was re-colonized when the highway tore apart minority communities and city planners re-built infrastructure that did not benefit the shattered neighborhoods. Fotsch claims "'urban renewal' came to be understood as a euphemism for 'negro removal.'" n61 In sum, a governing apparatus operating through housing and the highway machine implemented policies to segregate and maintain the isolation of poor, minority, and otherwise outcast populations. The accounts of segregation and isolation continue to this day. Some suburbs have diversified from some angles (multi-cultural [\*54] communities), but maintained their stratifying function from other angles (gated fortresses protecting pockets of elitist wealth). Working through discourses of containment and the perspectives of critical whiteness can offer a challenge to such arrangements, however, if only by adding to our understandings of the highway machine, suburbia, and the urban environment.

### Impact---Urban Sprawl/EJ---R/C of Warming

#### Dismantling of Segregated Lands is Key to Solve Global Warming

Mandell 8 ( Bekah, ADJUNCT Division of Continuing Professional Studies, RACIAL REIFICATION AND GLOBAL WARMING: A TRULY INCONVENIENT TRUTH, Spring 2008)

Scientists have warned of the dangers of climate change for decades, yet no meaningful steps have been taken to address its underlying causes; instead, ineffective strategies to reduce CO[2] emissions incrementally have become popular because they do not disturb the racial hierarchy that sustains the social, economic, and legal structure of the United States. The segregated land use patterns and transportation systems that dominate the U.S. landscape have reified race through the perpetuation of a distinct white over black racial hierarchy; those same land use patterns and transportation systems have contributed significantly to global warming by causing a dangerous spike in CO[2] emissions. To address the root causes of climate change thus requires a dismantling of the land use and transportation patterns that protect racial hierarchy and preserve white privilege in the United States. As a result, a consensus of inaction has developed to prevent meaningful reductions in emissions.

#### Suburbanization is one of the main causes for global warming; burns fossil fuels and destroys forest

Mandell 8 ( Bekah, ADJUNCT Division of Continuing Professional Studies, RACIAL REIFICATION AND GLOBAL WARMING: A TRULY INCONVENIENT TRUTH, Spring 2008)

The suburbanization of whiteness has created endless acres of suburbs in the United States. n296 Between 1982 and 2003, the growth in developed land in the United States far outpaced population growth, increasing by nearly half, as more and more of the population moved out to the suburbs. n297 In 1982, 72.9 million acres of the land in the United States were developed; twenty-one years later, by 2003, 108.1 million acres had been developed. n298 This new development transforms fields, farms, and forest into inefficient housing, featuring large footprints on large lots. n299 As whites have had to move farther and farther [\*337] from cities and inner-ring suburbs to preserve their privilege, the lots on which they have built their new homes have grown in size, eating up more land that was once forest or grassland. n300 This increased distance from basic needs and larger home sizes require increasing amounts of fossil fuels for transportation and for heating, cooling, and power. n301 Large, detached homes that define suburban living use much more energy than urban dwellings for several reasons. n302 Because newer suburban homes are much larger than the homes in the urban core and older first-ring suburbs, they demand much more energy to heat and cool than more compact homes. n303 Though they may take advantage of more efficient technologies, they are much less energy efficient than the townhouses or apartments that make up the bulk of urban housing stock because they cannot take advantage of the efficiency of shared heating and cooling systems that reduce overall energy consumption. n304 Moreover, the disastrous consequences of these inefficiencies are compounded by heating homes with fossil fuels such as oil or gas, the extraction of which releases CO[2] into the atmosphere. n305 Additionally, cooling large homes (many of which are located in the south where cooling systems are run year-round) is equally damaging to the CO[2] levels in the earth's atmosphere because of the vast amounts of [\*338] electricity these large homes use to run air conditioners and other cooling apparatuses. n306 Moreover, large, detached suburban homes consume much more energy in the form of electricity per dwelling than do urban homes. n307 Each suburban home has more electricity-consuming features than a typical urban home: more lights and more appliances. n308 Consuming increased amounts of electricity, these extra appliances demand increased electricity production. n309 Because "[t]he largest single source of carbon emissions in the United States is electricity production," these large homes have caused the release of hundreds of millions of tons of CO[2] into the earth's atmosphere. n310 The increased energy consumption of each individual suburban house is again compounded by the increased energy that low-density developments demand for public services. n311 Sprawling neighborhoods require more street lighting than dense, urban neighborhoods because they cover more ground with fewer efficiencies. n312 These added street lights put more pressure on power grids, increasing demand for electricity and requiring the generation of more power--a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions. n313 Additionally, suburban neighborhoods require more energy from fossil fuels to pump water and waste over larger [\*339] distances; they are unable to take advantage of infrastructure efficiencies in the way that more densely developed, urban neighborhoods do. n314 The lower-density development of suburban communities requires more miles of asphalt roads to be built and maintained. n315 Because a primary element of asphalt is oil, the construction and repaving of extensive suburban roadways contribute to increased levels of atmospheric CO[2]. n316 The significantly larger carbon footprint of these suburban homes actually begins before residents move in; the suburban construction boom has contributed to and continues to affect global warming as fossil fuels are burned during the construction of acre after acre of new homes. n317 The dump trucks, bulldozers, and other heavy machinery that make building a new home possible guzzle vast amounts of gasoline and spew CO[2] into the earth's atmosphere as they run. n318 The damage done by machines on the construction sites of the hundreds of thousands of suburban homes built since World War II is compounded further by the energy consumed to transport the building materials from their place of production to sprawling housing sites. n319 Furthermore, the materials commonly used to build larger suburban houses are yet another source of increased greenhouse gas emissions. n320 Most suburban homes have been constructed from wood, little of it sustainably harvested, contributing to deforestation, which is a significant [\*340] source of global warming. n321 Deforestation and unsustainable harvesting undermine the earth's ability to sequester CO[2] and keep it from entering the earth's atmosphere. n322 Though different forests offer varying degrees of carbon sequestration, or "sink" properties, forests are net carbon sinks, meaning they draw CO[2] out of the atmosphere as part of the photosynthesis process and trap it inside living trees where it cannot contribute to climate change. n323 As trees are cut down for lumber, the earth loses a precious source of carbon sequestration. n324 The degradation and loss of forested land effectively eliminates that land's ability to act as a sink to absorb new carbon emissions, undermining the earth's ability to regulate CO[2] levels in its atmosphere. n325 The process of clearing land to make way for development causes forests to become sources of CO[2] as the trees are unsustainably cleared or thinned and the carbon they had previously stored is released into the atmosphere. n326 Not only has suburban development caused a spike in the production of greenhouse gases, its land use patterns have reversed the planet's natural ability to store and regulate the amount of CO[2] in the atmosphere. n327 [\*341] As the suburbs have come to symbolize whiteness, the status that they confer on residents has caused them to become home to more of the country's population than any other type of development. n328 Since sprawl is by definition low-density, increasing suburban populations have converted millions of acres of land from forest and grassland to CO[2] producing uses.

#### Suburbanization Forces People to Drive Instead of using Public Transportations; causes Warming

Mandell 8 ( Bekah, ADJUNCT Division of Continuing Professional Studies, RACIAL REIFICATION AND GLOBAL WARMING: A TRULY INCONVENIENT TRUTH, Spring 2008)

Increased auto dependency further adds to the suburbs' effect on the climate by necessitating increased vehicular travel and fossil fuel consumption. n330 The federal subsidy of the suburbs and the passenger car has turned the suburbs into vast auto-dependant cul-de-sacs. n331 Because the suburbs are built to be navigated by individual vehicles, rather than public transit, the only reasonable means of getting around for the bulk of the country's population is private passenger cars. n332 The particular zoning of the suburbs requires that residents drive between home and school, between home and work, and between anywhere and the grocery store. n333 Auto-dependent development and the transportation hierarchy have increased car ownership in the United States, making it essential for every member of suburban households to have access to a car or risk complete isolation, both economic and social. n334 As the American population has become increasingly suburban, the number of trips taken by the average American in a private automobile has risen. n335 As a result of the increased need to travel by car for simple daily tasks, residents in low-density suburbs drive twenty to thirty percent more than residents living in neighborhoods with double the [\*342] density. n336 This increase in driving means that suburban residents' travel patterns alone cause them to consume twenty to thirty percent more fossil fuels, and emit twenty to thirty percent more greenhouse gases than their non-suburban counterparts. n337 To accommodate this increase in per capita automobile trips, car ownership has increased in the past few decades in the United States. n338 Though "the average household stayed roughly the same size from 1983 to 1990, as measured by the Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey . . . its auto travel grew by about 12,000 miles per year," due in large part to changes to suburban settlement patterns countrywide. n339 All of this driving contributes significantly to global climate change because cars burning gasoline emit millions of tons of CO[2] into the atmosphere, causing greenhouse gases to build up in the atmosphere. n340 Personal automobile trips are one of the most significant causes of CO[2] emission: fossil fuel emissions from car travel represent almost twenty-five percent of annual CO[2] emissions in the United States. n341 Considering that the average suburban household consumes 415 more gallons of gasoline per year than a household in a denser development and emits five metric tons more carbon per year than its more densely developed counterpart would, there can be no question regarding the environmental impact of the United States's pro-suburban, white-over-black policies. n342 The marked increase in personal automobile trips and car ownership in America is a direct result of suburbanization and the creation of the racialized transportation hierarchy. n343

### Impact---Urban Sprawl

#### Suburban sprawl deepens the socioeconomic dichotomy and exacerbates social and environmental issues – laundry list

Bullard 4(Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director, Environmental Justice Resource Center, Clark Atlanta University. “ADDRESSING URBAN TRANSPORTATION EQUITY IN THE UNITED STATES”, Fordham Urban Law Journal, October, page 1183, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb31&div=51&g_sent=1&collection=journals> EG)

In Sprawl City: Race, Politics, and Planning in Atlanta, the authors documented that government-subsidized sprawl has substantial social equity, civil rights, and health implications. 6 8 Suburban sprawl is fueled by the "iron triangle" of finance, land use planning, and transportation service delivery.169 Sprawl-fueled growth is widening the gap between the "haves" and "have-nots.' 170 Suburban sprawl has clear social and environmental effects. 171 The social effects of suburban sprawl include concentration of urban core poverty, closed opportunity, limited mobility, economic disinvestment, social isolation, and urban/suburban disparities that closely mirror racial inequities. 172 The environmental effects of suburban sprawl include urban infrastructure decline, increased energy consumption, automobile dependency, threats to public health and the environment, including air pollution, flooding, and climate change, and threats to farm land and wildlife habitat.173 Many jobs have shifted to the suburbs and communities where public transportation is inadequate or nonexistent. 174 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.' 75 Between 1990 and 1997, jobs on the fringe of metropolitan areas grew by 19% versus 4% job growth in core areas. 176 While many new jobs are being created in the suburbs, the majority of job opportunities for low-income workers are still located in central cities.' 77 Suburbs are increasing their share of office space, while central cities see their share declining.' 78 The suburban share of the met-ropolitan office space is 69.5% in Detroit, 65.8% in Atlanta, 57.7% in Washington, D.C., 57.4% in Miami, and 55.2% in Philadelphia. 179 Getting to these suburban jobs without a car is next to impossible. It is no accident that Detroit leads in suburban "office sprawl." Detroit is also the most segregated big city in the United States18° and the only major metropolitan area without a regional transit system."' 1 Detroit really is the Motor City-only about 2.4% of metropolitan Detroiters use transit to get to work.182

#### Geographic segregation from a lack of a public transit creates environmental injustice and institutional segregation

Chen 7 – former Executive Director and founding CEO of Smart Growth America (Don, Senior Program Officer at the Ford Foundation, member of the Boards of Directors of West Harlem Environmental Action, Grist Magazine, the Institute for Location Efficiency, and the Growth Management Leadership Alliance, 2/1/07, *Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice, And Regional Equity*, edited by Robert D. Bullard (Dean of the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University, former Ware Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University), pp. 306-307, p. Google Books)

Significantly, traditional efforts to fight poverty as well as promote civil rights and environmental justice are also now increasingly exploring the roles of land use and geography as contributors to disparate impacts. For example, civil rights scholar Sheryll Cashin’s (2004) The Failures of Integration looks at how the consequences of geographic segregation on access to opportunities are beginning to undermine the gains that our nation has made in fighting institutional segregation. In her search for solutions, Cashin (2004, 307) offers three “coalition and community building" opportunities that could help the civil rights movement: “(1) coalitions in metropolitan regions that are trying to bring about more equity in the allocation of resources, benefits, and social burdens; (2) organizations that are committed to physical development and building social capital in low-income, mostly minority communities; and (3) coalitions that work to foster sustainable development and counter the forces of suburban sprawl.” While acknowledging potential challenges to true coalition building, she argues that “together, [these groups] could seed a movement for a transformative integration of the races and classes" (Cashin 2004, 308).

There is much promise in Cashin's proposal. Both the smart growth groups that managed to protect their communities from the most egregious toxic threats have since expanded their focus to address a wider array of health and economic challenges. A tour of some of the nation’s best-known environmental justice groups reveals initiatives to boost transit service in communities of color, reclaim abandoned buildings, create urban parks, build affordable housing, plan for transit-oriented development, and pursue many other community and regional planning objectives.3

These efforts sound like smart growth objectives, which have been developed as an alternative approach to land development that is more responsible than sprawl development. According to Clark Atlanta University sociologist Robert Bullard (one of the founders of the environmental justice movement), haphazard sprawl development is the leading threat to communities of color, low-income families, and the environmental justice movement as a whole (Bullard, Johnson, and Torres 2000b). As cofounders of Smart Growth America, Bullard, Carl Anthony, and other environmental justice leaders have strongly encouraged smart growth advocates to help support the goals of environmental justice.

#### Highway investment is the root cause of racial segregation

Sanchez 03 (Thomas 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”. http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/transportation/moving-to-equity-addressing-inequitable-effects-of-transportation-policies-on-minorities/sanchez-moving-to-equity-transportation-policies.pdf)

The previous section examined the direct effects of transportation policies on low-income minorities’ finances and their ability simply to get around. This section examines the indirect effects of transportation policies. One of the central indirect effects is the reinforcement of residential segregation. The form that we currently think of as “the city” is a product of both land use and transportation investment decisions. Highway investments in combination with federal housing and lending policies leading to post–World War II suburbanization played a significant role in “white flight” from central cities to suburbs, which had a profound impact in defining urban form and racial segregation patterns.96 Highway investment encourages the development of suburbs located increasingly farther away from central cities and has played an important role in fostering residential segregation patterns and income inequalities.97 Inequitable or inefficient land use patterns such as those resulting in residential segregation often are reinforced by policies, such as transportation investment decisions, that were established several decades ago. As many researchers have documented, residential segregation greatly influences minorities’ access to housing, education, and economic opportunities.98 More research, however, needs to be performed examining the relationship between transportation policies and residential segregation and how it should be addressed.

### Inherency---No Public Transport

#### Inherency

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

According to a recent survey by the American¶ Public Transportation Association, state, regional and local funding for more than 80 percent of U.S. transit systems has remained flat or has fallen lately, and nearly 90 percent of those systems¶ have had to raise fares or cut service. Nearly half have done both.34 The remainder of this chapter¶ consists of lists, maps, and case studies attempting to put into further perspective the financial¶ challenges faced by U.S. transit operators.¶ First are two lists summarizing research into projected deficits, as well as fare increases. These¶ lists include only the 25 largest transit operators in America, although those agencies account for¶ about two-thirds of all transit ridership in the U.S. The first list shows, as a percentage of current¶ operating budgets, the maximum deficits that were projected this year. For a number of reasons,¶ these figures should be viewed as approximate.

### Busing---Expansion Key

#### Busing system needs modernization

Mann 96 (Eric Mann, Eric Mann is the director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles and a co-founder of the Bus Riders Union. The Strategy Center is a “think tank/act tank” that trains organizers and initiates high visibility environmental justice, mass transportation, and civil rights campaigns, “A NEW VISION

FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION”, 1996, http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf)

Expansion of the bus fleet would dramatically increase bus ridership by at least 25 per-cent in three years, with the goal of doubling ridership over 10 years.¶ Through spending the vast majority of its discretionary funds on the rail system, allowing service to deteriorate, raising its fares, and allowing many of its buses to become unrepairable, the MTA has presided over the single most devastating dismantling of a public transportation system in recent U.S. history. This dismantling process has resulted in a decline in ridership despite the fact that the need for services has increased. This duality is reflected in the fact that, though the need for transit services has increased as the population¶ Los Angeles is one of the largest and most spatially spread-out urban centers in the United States. A bus system is the only type of mass transportation mode that is flexible enough to serve such an area. Our objectives in massively expand-ing the bus fleet. Los Angeles County has grown by 774,000 between 1985 and 1995, ridership has decreased by over 134 million in the same period.¶ The connection between the size of the fleet and ridership levels is compelling. The decline in ridership began in 1985, after a three-year period in which ridership had expanded by 41 percent. This expansion was due to both the reduced fare that was in effect from 1982 to 1985 and the fact that the bus system had the capacity (albeit with difficulty, sometimes at 180 percent capacity at rush hour) to handle increasing numbers of riders because the fleet was relatively large, reaching a height of 3,000 vehicles in 1984. In parallel terms, the trend towards declining ridership beginning in 1985 was due, in part, to the increase in fares and the fact that the MTA had declining vehicle capacity for riders because the agency spent no money to purchase new buses from 1986 onward. Even the replacement buses were purchased far behind schedule.¶ In response to the downward trends in rider-ship, the Bus Riders Union has done its own research, thanks to the work of transportation planner Ryan Snyder, former RTD chief financial officer Tom Rubin, and Chris Mathis and Eric Mann’s many discussions with MTA transit plan-ners who are sympathetic to the need for more bus purchases. These planners refer to and we celebrate the “cascading effect”—that is, the more buses the MTA buys the less overcrowding there is, and the more consumer demand will be generated, producing another trend towards overcrowding and the subsequent need to buy even more buses to again reduce load factors. In other words, the combination of lower load factors, improvements in existing service, and lower fares will create a demand for new service. The Bus Riders Union conservatively estimates a 10 percent increase in ridership from a fare reduction, significant service improve-ments and aggressive pass marketing after the first year. We also estimate a 25 percent increase in ridership based on sustained improvements after three years in which overcrowding levels are maintained at 1.1; and up to a 50 percent increase in ridership over 5 years under our plan. The MTA does not dispute these estimates. In fact, Alan Pegg, the former head of RTD, put forth views that support the BRU’s analysis, arguing that there is such pent up demand for bus service that any reduction in fares or increases in the total number of buses would generate many more customers for the MTA. Thus, we uphold the radical argument that one purpose of a public transportation agency is to encourage, rather than discourage, the public to use public transportation.

#### Bus fleet expansion solves

Mann 96 (Eric Mann, Eric Mann is the director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles and a co-founder of the Bus Riders Union. The Strategy Center is a “think tank/act tank” that trains organizers and initiates high visibility environmental justice, mass transportation, and civil rights campaigns, “A NEW VISION

FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION”, 1996, http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf)

Expansion of the bus fleet would create viable north/south, east/west transfers for the hundreds of thousands of daily riders who take at least two buses to their destination.¶ At present, the wait for buses at key transfer points is intolerable. Resolution of this problem will also involve dramatic expansion of the fleet. Most bus riders are traveling north/south and east/west with at least one connection in a county of 4,000 square miles. If headways are reduced on the main north/south arteries, but people still have to wait 20 more minutes for the east/west connec-tion, the system doesn’t work. It is precisely expansion of service on all major arteries that will allow a viable transfer system to work.¶ E) Expansion of the bus fleet would provide long-distance, low-fare limited stop and express service—allowing inner-city residents true mobility in the county.¶ Los Angeles’ economy, job market, and public resources—parks, beaches, museums, universities, hospitals—are regional in nature. The economy is made up of a moving, shifting, decentralized group of small business centers, many of which have at their foundation low-wage industries.¶ Because of the county’s spatial and economic framework, transportation in the Los Angeles region needs to be flexible and must cross municipal boundaries and even county lines. We, thus, take issue with the MTA’s efforts to reduce our discussion to an “inner city” focus, rather than addressing an overall regional transportation plan that recognizes that “minority” and poor populations live virtually everywhere and must have access to all parts of the Los Angeles region to meet basic needs.¶ In discussions with the MTA, the agency has acknowledged that many of its buses are over their 12 year projected use, are “down” for repair much of the year, and are being kept on the road only because the MTA does not want to spend funds to replace them. Bus drivers tell us a far more harrowing stories: “The bus fleet is in shambles,” and “My bus is falling apart at the seams.” Existing bus improvement plans attempt to avoid replacing old buses in the existing fleet let alone expanding it. We demand that, of the 2,000 buses in the current fleet, a minimum of 300 new replacement buses be purchased immediately, and 500 by the end of three years.¶ To deal with the problem of first class public transportation provision over an enormous geo-graphic area, the Bus Riders Union has been advocating new freeway express service for buses. Currently in Los Angeles County, there are approximately 55 bus lines operating express service on freeways. However, several problems exist with this system: (1) It is primarily oriented between suburban locations and downtown Los Angeles. Only 8 percent of the county’s jobs are there. People need to be able to get to other important work centers such as the LAX area, Pasa-dena/Glendale/Burbank, Westwood/Century City, Mid-Wilshire, Van Nuys and Warner Center to name some of the most important ones; (2) The service is primarily oriented one-way, again to downtown Los Angeles. People need service which goes out from transit-dependent neighborhoods to other areas as well; (3) Some of the service operates only during peak commute hours. To be dependable and to serve people who need to travel outside peak periods for work, medical purposes, etc., it must run throughout the day, well into the evening, and on weekends; (4) Some of the lines take long, circuitous routes on surface streets before entering the freeway.¶ G) Expansion of the bus fleet would occur in combination with a process of making buses safer and more accessible to all riders.¶ A doubling of security expenditures, directed especially to late-night hour security on buses and at bus stops, as well as strict rules of conduct for MTA police to protect passenger civil rights and civil liberties will make the buses safer places. These security measures would be accompanied by an immediate inventory of all needs for disabled passengers, including the blind, such as the usage of wheelchair ramps and the training and education of drivers to fully comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.¶ Moreover, the key to increased bus security is more buses, not more police. Reducing the over-crowding on the buses and the long waits on dangerous street corners is far more cost effective than padding the MTA police force—a maneuver Mayor Riordan is trying to accomplish to solve a campaign promise to hire 1,000 new police. In addition, a pilot project should be initiated for neighborhood escort services to hire youth to escort people to their homes or to help elderly or disabled passengers on the buses.¶ In short, we must implement a county-wide bus improvement plan that includes a significant expansion of MTA long-distance service to areas in which MTA service is non-existent or non-viable. Our proposed system would expand to serve important centers outside downtown Los Angeles, operate bi-directionally, have shorter headways, operate all day long and on weekends, and would emanate and terminate in more locations along the freeways. Some transit experts have estimated an ideal express system such as the one described above would require over 1,000 additional buses. We accept the more basic plan of 500-600 buses, however, with a focus on the needs of the transit-dependent.

### AT Politics DA---Impact Calc/ Link UQ

#### Your DAs are non-unique---transportation fights now---only placing equity at the heart of our decision-calculus as opposed to political concerns can deliver basic human-rights to all

**Leadership Conference Education Fund 11** was established in 1969 to promote social justice goals (civilrights.org), “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity” March, http://www.aapd.com/what-we-do/transportation/where-we-need-to-go.pdf

This year, Congress will consider the surface transportation reauthorization bill, allocating a signicant investment of federal dollars to repair our aging infrastructure and expand it to meet the needsof our 21st-century economy. **Budget limitations will mean intense competition among projects**—and the nextinvestment in transportation will have a profound impacton every American. Our transportation policy has the potential to expand economic opportunity for low-income Americansand underrepresented workers by connecting themto highway, transit, and rail construction jobs.Transportation spending generates jobs for workers in the construction industry and also has indirect effects on job creation by increasing the efciencyof the transportation system and improving businessproductivity. On the other hand, our transportation policy has the potential to exacerbate many Americans’isolation from jobs and resources. At a time of highunemployment and unprecedented income inequality,**equity in transportation policy is one of the most pressing civil and human rights issues our nation faces**. As policymakers discuss such important issues as howbest to rebuild and repair our nation’s roads, bridges, railways, and ports, and where and how to prioritize investments in public transportation, it is vital that they take into consideration the needs of communities of color, low-income people, people with disabilities, seniors, and poor rural communities. **Transportation and mobility play key roles in the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity**. Historically, issues related to transportation were integral to the civil rights movement—embodied in theMontgomery Bus Boycott and the Freedom Rides—**yet, the civil rights implications of transportation policies have been largely ignored** until recent years. Civil and human rights concerns must inform current decisions about where to build highways, the right way to expand transit, and how to connect people with jobs andcommunity resources. The purpose of this paper is tohighlight an important opportunity for all segments of society to participate fully in the debates around our nation’s transportation policy to ensure no community isleft behind.

### AT Politics DA---Plan Popular

**The plan is popular with public and officials---perceived immediate benefits**

David A. **King 9** Colombia University “Remediating Inequity in Transportation Finance” Remediating Inequity in Transportation Finance, SPECIAL REPORT 303: EQUITY OF EVOLVING TRANSPORTATION FINANCE MECHANISMS, http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr303King.pdf

Investing transportation revenues into transit is one way to promote geographic equity and improve transportation choices for low-income travelers and those who are affected by new charges. In addition, **transit is politically popular among elected officials and the public for congestion reduction**. A prominent example of transit investment from pricing occurred in London. In 2003, London instituted a cordon toll that charged motorists for entering the central city. In anticipation of the cordon charges, Transport for London purchased 300 new buses and increased the kilometers of service in operation to the greatest extent since the 1960s (33). The combination of new charges for motorists and expanded bus operations helped increase bus ridership almost 20 percent (31) and demonstrated immediate benefits to the public.

**Plan is popular**

Susan **Hanson 4** is the professor and director of the school of geography at Clark University“The Geography of Urban Transportation” Google Books p.326

Given this overview of the geography of urban transportation finance, what trends do we see as we look to the future? First, and perhaps foremost, the geopolitics of transportation finance are firmly established at all levels of government and are likely to remain so for the forseeable future. This means that public investment in transportation systems will continue to be determined more by political struggles over the spatial distribution of resources than by other factors such as transportation system use, costs imposed, or ability to pay. There have been a few notable challenges to the prevailing focus on big-ticket transportation capital projects. “Freeway revolts” by citizens and environmental advocacy groups in cities around the United States during the 1960s and 1970s halted some high-profile freeway projects in cities like Boston, New Orleans, Reno, and San Francisco. **These social movements contributed to a weakening of political support for funding metropolitan freeway development and a shift toward increased investment in public transit systems** (Taylor, 1995). More recently, transit passenger advocacy organizations have challenged fare increases and service cuts in Atlanta, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, and, most notably, Los Angeles. In 1994, a coalition of civil rights and advocacy organizations filed a federal civil rights lawsuit against the LA MTA over a proposed fare increase. The plaintiffs alleged that the LA MTA was increasing fares and short-shrifting investments in the local bus system (which was disproportionately patronized by the poor and by racial-ethnic minorities), while pouring resources into new rail lines and commuter-oriented services (which disproportionately benefitted higher-income, nonminority riders). While the LA MTA denied the allegations, the suit was settled with a consent decree in 1996, which, among other things, limited future fare increases and mandated improvements to local bus service for 10 years (Brown, 1998; Grengs, 2002). Despite these high-profile challenges to the status quo, however, the emphasis on transportation capital investments over spending on operations and maintenance also shows little sign of abating. While the overcapitalization of transportation systems is clearly economically inefficient, **it is politically popular and likely to remain so**. This means that transportation investments will continue to emphasize projects over programs, lines and modes over integrated systems, and expenditures over savings.

**Transit is politically popular**

Robert **Poole 11** reason.org “Surface Transportation Innovations #96” Oct 25 http://reason.org/news/printer/surface-transportation-news-96

So here is my suggestion of a better way forward. The original purpose of the Highway Trust Fund, when it was created in 1956, was to build key highway corridors linking the country together. It was only opened up to transit in the early 1980s, when President Reagan’s DOT Secretary Drew Lewis made a deal to gain urban interests’ support for a 5 cents/gallon increase in the fuel tax by dedicating one of those five cents to a new Mass Transit Account within the HTF. There is no transit user tax supporting what is now 20% of the HTF that goes to transit. **But transit is politically popular, and there is no chance that Congress would stop funding it.**

### AT Econ DA

#### Solves jobs, competitiveness, 6x economic multiplier, land values

 Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

ECONOMIC AND EQUITY BENEFITS¶ Public transportation costs money to operate—but it can save households and businesses¶ thousands of dollars a year. It also generates profits, jobs, tax revenue, new development and redevelopment,¶ and it enhances land values and economic competitiveness.¶ Indeed, transit is one of the best investments we can make in difficult economic times. According¶ to one study, every dollar invested in transit generates six dollars’ worth of economic¶ activity.7 Every $10 million invested in transit operations, the same study found, can be expected¶ to result in approximately 570 jobs and $32 million in sales for businesses.¶ Moreover, as of 2006, transit agencies employed 369,000 Americans, a population greater¶ than that of St. Louis, Pittsburgh or Tampa. The average annual salary for these employees was¶ approximately $57,000,8 and positions in transit operations and maintenance are blue-collar,¶ green jobs that cannot be outsourced. So, too, are construction jobs generated by building new¶ transit lines and stations, vehicles, and maintenance facilities.¶ Transit can also save families a great deal of money. One recent study found that, by avoiding¶ auto-related costs such as fuel, parking, payments, insurance, and repair, the average American¶ household can save close to $8,700 per year, or $724 per month,9 through transit use. This figure¶ is unsurprising when you consider that the average annual cost to own and operate a car, according¶ to the American Automobile Association, is nearly $10,000.10 The Center for Neighborhood¶ Technology, meanwhile, has found that families living in “location efficient” areas where public¶ transit is available spend as little as 15 percent of their household incomes on transportation—or¶ about half as much as transportation can cost families in “inefficient” locations without transit.11¶ The savings made possible by transit are especially important to Americans in low-income¶ households, many of whom are forced to drive by a lack of transit options. As of 2005, 73 percent¶ of households below the federal poverty line had a car,12 and on average, working families¶ making between $20,000 and $50,000 spend close to 30 percent of their household incomes on¶ transportation—more than they spend on housing.13 Using Bureau of Labor Statistics data from¶ 2003, however, researcher Todd Litman has found that low-income households without a car¶ spend a significantly smaller percentage of their income on transportation than households with¶ a car—several times smaller for households earning less than $30,000 a year.14 Of course, poor¶ families can always save money by buying cheaper cars; but then cheaper cars are less reliable, so¶ repair costs are higher, and workers can lose their jobs if their cars suddenly become unavailable¶ and no transit alternative exists.¶ Public transportation connecting low-income communities to jobs, then, is a necessity. It is¶ essential to provide affordable and reliable access to employment opportunities for low-income¶ workers. But transit also benefits regional economies, as businesses profit from a larger labor pool.¶ Public transportation access is essential to ensuring that regional economies are equitable, fair,¶ and benefit all of their citizens.

### AT Federalism

#### Federalism contributes to spatial inequality.

Kim, 2k8 (Sukkoo, Associate Professor, Department of Economics UCLA, Economic History; Urban and Regional Economics; Trade and Development ,“Spatial Inequality and Economic Development: Theories, Facts and Policies” https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:wm0xC4ZyVu8J:www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/kim\_final\_draft.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjEtZgJt4maAQXU7At0qH\_d6skw73SUk1JBRHjSLLFc1EQzvvJUahEmJkZaTfibs8Qq8BW4R346hQGNxlBWVmtBQ79ZOVylFk112mCYbC1ElO1EEmb5ugvpWMA-ZukxiWqkyGi2&sig=AHIEtbTf2vSCCjxg9M1XO5gWyBYFu19gJA&pli=1, March 2008)

Federalism or the balance of political power between the federal, state and local jurisdictions is also likely to matter greatly for spatial inequality. In the United States, the nation emerged with a weak federal government that gave significant political power to the states and local governments until the second half of the twentieth century. As a consequence, American style federalism is likely to have contributed to greater spatial equality over time (Kim (2008)).

### AT States

#### Public demands on the federal government for public transportation are necessary to a consciousness shift away from militarism towards a national-solidarity with equality as its center-piece---only federal oversight creates the necessary national-momentum against neoliberalism

Mann 96 (Eric Mann, Eric Mann is the director of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles and a co-founder of the Bus Riders Union. The Strategy Center is a “think tank/act tank” that trains organizers and initiates high visibility environmental justice, mass transportation, and civil rights campaigns, “A NEW VISION

FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION”, 1996, http://www.uchastings.edu/faculty-administration/faculty/piomelli/class-website/docs/Bus-Riders-Union-New-Vision.pdf)

Community economic conversion and development¶ In movement terms, “economic conversion” is usually restricted to the peace movement’s important efforts to demand that the federal government dramatically restrict the military/industrial complex and invest in socially useful production. “Community economic development” is a notion that, too often, has been shaped by corporate and political elites trying to tie community groups to the corporate agenda. Corporations use this practice with the goal of precluding militant and more structural demands on the system—encouraging Latino, African American, Asian, and poor white working class community activists to adopt an entrepreneurial strategy. This usually results in the co-optation of community leadership under the mantra of “empowerment,” the diversion of com-munity energy and focus, and actual reductions in community wealth and political power. (For a detailed analysis of the corporatization of commu-nity movements and a methodology to develop an alternate model of community economic develop-ment, see the Strategy Center’s report, Recon-structing Los Angeles—and U.S. Cities—from the Bottom Up.)¶ At its best, however, community economic development could contain a radical notion—that the fights over society’s economic resources, and over the choices made by federal, state, regional, and municipal governments and agencies reflect a critical arena for the struggle for economic justice. This struggle contextualizes the fight between rich and poor, between the use and abuse of public¶ 24¶ funds, and between a military appropriation of the budget and a focus on human services. These political choices, until new terms can be constructed and agreed upon, can reside within the categories called economic conversion and com-munity economic development, and will be given meaning and content in the analysis that follows.¶ The Los Angeles region contains too much military production, not enough civilian, environ-mentally-sound production, a very low-wage labor base, an anti-union labor climate, and massive levels of unemployment in areas such as South Central Los Angeles. In addition to transforming the mobility of low-income people, the use of public funds to construct a first-class mass transit system has great potential to address the employment, community development, and industrial production problems described above.¶ A) The demand that the federal courts mandate massive shifts in funds towards the bus system and away from rail, and essentially place the MTA in trusteeship, is a form of economic conversion within the MTA, supporting the Billions for Buses plan of the Bus Riders Union.¶ This sharpens the class content of “economic conversion” to demand that government funds directly serve the transportation needs of low-income people and communities of color.¶ B) Key elements of economic development should be the protection, support, and creation of unionized, high-wage jobs, all of which re-quire that the MTA have an anti-privatization policy that protects and creates public sector jobs.¶ The results of transit privatization are clear—”efficiency” is simply a code for private profit and the public expense. To begin with, service for riders can deteriorate drastically under privatization. In Fairfax County, Virginia, Miami, and New Orleans, public transportation authorities broke contracts due to irresponsible and unsafe service-provision and contract management performed by the private contractors.¶ Moreover, pro- and anti-privatization forces agree that the major element of cost-saving for private transit contractors is the reduction of wages and benefits. Transportation planner Alan Black writes that “Bus drivers for the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, who have a union, received a top scale of $13.07 per hour in 1990. In nearby Johnson County, Kansas, where a private firm supplied the service and there was no union, the maximum wage was $7.00 per hour. A Florida union official stated that private firms ‘can hire people easily for half the price that they pay our people.’” Black also refers to a 1986 study that showed that the compensation level for unionized bus drivers at private firms was 21 percent less than that for public agency bus drivers and that compensation for non-unionized bus drivers at private companies was 45 percent lower than that for drivers at public systems.¶ The debate surrounding transit privatization is particularly pertinent to Los Angeles because there is a clear ideological trend at the MTA towards increased contracting out of bus lines and opera-tions. The Bus Riders Union opposes any plans for privatization and contracting out based on the direct correlation between privatization and the busting of unions and the depression of wages. The ideological trend towards privatization has manifested itself in two ways recently in Los Angeles:¶ (1) There is the constant threat that more MTA bus lines will be contracted out to private companies such as Foothill Transit, which already runs more than 20 bus lines that were formerly run directly by the MTA. William Forsythe, President of Forsythe and Associates, Inc., which manages Foothill’s administrative operations, and Foothill Transit’s major contractor, Laidlaw, are consistent players in MTA politics, pushing for further contracting out of services. In 1993 and 1994, they contributed well over $10,000 to different members of the MTA Board. Mayor Riordan received at least $2,500 in contributions from them. Not surprisingly, during the 1994 MTA transit strike, Mayor Riordan played a major role in a settlement that forced the union to accept the contracting out of 13 more bus lines—most of which went to Foothill.¶ Currently, whereas the unionized bus drivers of the MTA earn an average hourly wage of $18.45, Foothill Transit’s contractors pay their drivers $11 per hour. The myth of the “happy privatized worker” was exploded when the MTA bus drivers went on strike for the radical demand of company-paid medical benefits and a raise, only 25¶ to be forced back to work broken and defeated when the company threatened to replace them with permanent strike breakers.¶ (2) One of the chief executives of the MTA recently lauded the “London model” of transit provision as one that should be emulated by the MTA. It appeared that he was attracted to the model because the London transportation agency runs relatively few bus lines itself, but instead, simply takes public money and dispenses it to private contractors. London’s system was gradu-ally contracted out under a scheme similar to that of cities in the United States. Between 1985 and 1993 around 5 percent of the total network has been newly contracted out each year. By 1995, just under 50 percent of London’s bus miles were secured through contracting out. Cost savings under contracting out in London are estimated to be at 14 percent, while hourly wage reductions among transit workers during the same period are estimated to be at 16 percent. Thus, again, the great majority of savings under that plan of privatization came directly from labor. The Bus Riders Union must be vigilant in its opposition to privatization as the MTA talks about emulating the gradual plan of contracting out that comes from London.¶ It is clear that privatization is brutal public policy. If government officials want to force down the wages of bus drivers, janitors, and secretaries while allowing 344 percent cost overruns for rail contractors they should just say so, and stop put-ting forth humble offerings to the gods of “effi-ciency.” It was precisely in the public sector that the major employment gains of the civil rights movement were won. The BRU understands that these gains must be protected and expanded. The Bus Riders Union will not fight to improve bus service at the cost of allowing the MTA to lay-off or reduce the wages of decently paid, unionized, minority and female workers.¶ C) The MTA should use its contracting power to create a bus production system in South Los Angeles, with manufacturers of electric/ hydro-gen fuel cell buses at its core.¶ Many bus manufacturers can operate with an-nual orders of 200 buses, and employ approxi-mately 200 to 300 production workers accompanied by additional clerical and support staff. These manufacturers could supplement their sales to the Los Angeles MTA with sales to other areas around the country, generating more jobs in Los Angeles. MTA contracts for CNG, electric, or other low or zero emission buses, should be given to employers who will hire from high unemploy-ment areas. The workforce within this bus produc-tion system should be unionized and well-paid.¶ D) Military funds should be diverted to non-polluting mass transit.¶ The Pentagon budget should be targeted for billions of dollars in new public funds for both peace/civilian and environmentally-constructive jobs. Movements such as that of the Bus Riders Union should not limit their federal search for funds to the Department of Transportation and ISTEA, but should also demand a dramatic seizure of funds from the Pentagon budget for bus and other urban transportation operating and capital costs.¶ E) Federal officials must create oversight mechanisms to stop politicians from using ISTEA’s flexible federal funding options as vote-seeking tools for the construction of rail projects, and, instead, allow funds for the direct purchase of vehicles, road improvements to handle bus service, and bus operating funds for the long-term.¶ F) The MTA should work with local merchants, neighborhood groups, and area planning groups to develop local bus routes that more explicitly carry the urban poor to areas that have high concentrations of available jobs, that link commercial/retail areas with consumers, and that link community residents to services and goods that they need.¶ G) The MTA should initiate and pay for a community bus depot construction program.¶ These community depots would be built by lo-cal, unionized, well-paid workers and would be supplemented by a series of better-constructed bus shelters that have shade, designs, water fountains, and bus schedules, replacing our current bus stops that are a metal pole with a bus route sign on it (unless they are the “deluxe” model that boasts a plastic awning). The goal would be to use bus¶ 26¶ depots as community institutions-–highly visible like those designed by the Project for Public Space. These bus depots could become the hub of local community development projects, with community designers generating newsstands, small stores, pedestrian malls, and high-security lighting and escort services as a way of revitalizing communi-ties. Rather than speculative developers buying up property in anticipation of a rail station that may never have many passengers, the bus depot project could attract undercapitalized businesses, giving preference to women and minority designers, architects, and artists to design, along with com-munity input, capital projects of a more modest but still substantial level—e.g. about $1 million in land acquisition, $1 million in construction costs per depot.¶ C) All MTA meetings should be held on week-day evenings or Saturdays to allow truly mass participation.¶ D) All MTA members should be required to attend all public hearings on budget items and should be banned from eating, caucusing, using portable phones, or leaving their seat vacant for hours.¶ E) All MTA members should be prohibited from receiving campaign contributions from any contrac-tors who seek funds from the agency.¶ F) The MTA should be prohibited from using the MTA police to threaten, intimidate, hit, or beat protesting bus riders and other critics of the agency. Unarmed security should be used to deal with extreme cases of disruptive behavior by unarmed protesters. Public and collective expressions of anger and protest must be protected and legitimized. The MTA cannot both attack the public with its policies and then restrict the rights of those who suffer as a result.¶ H) All jobs bid by MTA contracts guaranteed no lower than $8 an hour, with non-interference in union activities and affirmative action hiring built into the contract structure.

#### **Private investors won’t support the plan absent predictable federal support – and leadership is key**

Melaniphy 12 (Michael P. Melaniphy, President & CEO American Public Transportation Association, “Michael P. Melaniphy, President & CEO American Public Transportation Association Before The Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations”, 3/21, <http://www.apta.com/gap/testimony/2012/Pages/120319_SenateTestimony.aspx> EG)

APTA’s overall funding recommendation continues to be informed by our recommendations for surface transportation authorization and the estimated federal funding growth required to meet at least 50 percent of the $60 billion in annual transit capital needs. These levels are intended to support a projected doubling of transit ridership over the next 20 years. It is important to stress that the demand for public transportation and the need for federal leadership will not diminish in the months and years ahead. As gasoline prices continue to increase, Americans are turning to public transportation in record numbers, just as they did in 2008 when gas reached an average price of $4.11 per gallon. Public transportation is a vital component of the nation’s total transportation infrastructure picture, and with ridership projected to grow, dependable public transportation systems will be vital to the transportation needs of millions of Americans. While Congress continues to consider how to proceed on a well-funded, multi-modal surface transportation bill, it remains critically important that annual appropriations bills support both current and growing needs. Federal Transit Administration Programs Capital Investment Grants (New Starts) – APTA was pleased to see the Senate continue to support the New Starts program in MAP-21. The New Starts program is the primary source of federal investment in the construction or expansion of heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit projects. The success of these major, multi-year capital projects requires predictable support by Congress and the FTA. Congress established Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs) to provide this predictability. A continued commitment to federal investment will also influence the willingness of private financial markets to finance public transportation projects and it will help ensure that the bond ratings will remain high and interest rates will remain low. We urge the Congress to recognize the importance of long-term, predictable funding for all highway and transit programs, including New Starts. APTA believes that the New Starts program should grow at the same rate as the rest of the transit program, as it is essential to enhancing our nation’s mobility, accessibility and economic prosperity, while promoting energy conservation and environmental quality. Formula and Bus and Bus Facilities - APTA seeks to continue funding for existing formula programs, including urban and rural formula, small transit intensive cities (STIC), fixed guideway modernization, and others at a rate consistent with overall FTA funding growth. These formula programs address core needs of our public transportation systems, and deserve the continued support of Congress. APTA has recommended that Congress equitably balance the various needs of the nation’s diverse bus systems, including those operated by multimodal agencies. APTA has called for modifying the current Bus and Bus Facilities program to create two separate categories of funding, with 50 percent distributed under bus formula factors, and the remaining 50 percent available under a discretionary program distributed either through Congressional direction or a competitive grants process. MAP-21, the Senate authorization bill, creates a new structure for State of Good Repair grants with a new formula program (high intensity motorbus state of good repair) that focuses on systems that have a large number of bus rapid transit, express bus or other high intensity bus routes that may no longer qualify for fixed guideway formula funds. The Senate-passed version of MAP-21 also provides a new $75 million general fund bus discretionary program authorization. The new program provides another source of assistance for bus capital needs beyond the new formula funds the bill makes available, with priority consideration provided to bus-only transit agencies.

#### **Federal leadership key to establish clear goals and uniformity in public transit**

Puentes 8 (Robert, Brookings Institute, “A Bridge to Somewhere: Rethinking American Transportation for the 21st Century”, June, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2008/6/transportation%20puentes/06_transportation_puentes_policybrief.pdf> EG)

Limitations of Existing Federal Policy While there is a pervasive desire to invest, the real challenges facing the network are far more fundamental. Absent federal leadership results in no overarching vision, goals, or guidance. Outdated policies means that federal transportation policy has only haltingly recognized metropolitan areas’ centrality to transportation outcomes, and continues to favor roads over transit and other non-motorized alternatives. And the lack of performance data and accountability means the federal grantees are underperforming and failing to maximize efficiencies. A New Federal Approach Transportation is a means to an end, not the end itself. The nation should settle for nothing less than evidence-based, values-driven decisionmaking. This means the development of a three-pronged strategy for our national transportation program: n The federal government must lead in those areas where there are clear demands for national uniformity or else to match the scale or geographic reach of certain problems. The U.S. needs to define, design and embrace a new, unified, competitive vision for transportation policy—for both passenger and freight that includes its purpose, its mission, its overarching rationale. n The federal government should empower states and metropolitan areas to grow in competitive, inclusive, and sustainable ways. Major metropolitan areas should be given more direct funding and project selection authority to enable them to embrace market mechanisms, pursue a strategy of “modality neutrality,” and develop truly integrated transportation, land use, and economic development plans. n The federal government should optimize Washington’s own performance and that of its partners to maximize metropolitan prosperity. In order to rebuild public trust, the rationale for the federal program should be apparent to the American people and contain an explicit set of outcomes.

#### Federal oversight necessary to enforce planning mandates

Olson 1 (Benjamin K., J.D. from Georgetown University and B.A. from Tulane University, “The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century: The Failure of Metropolitan Planning Organizations to Reform Federal Transportation Policy in Metropolitan Areas,” Transportation Journal, Volume 28, Issue 147, http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/tportl28&div=12&id=&page=)

This paper proposes that, in order to truly implement transportation planning reform in metropolitan areas, the federal government will have to play a more active role in the planning process. Because efforts to increase the independence of MPOs vis-a-vis state governments will not ensure reform if federal planning requirements and oversight are not strengthened, TEA-21 must be amended to make application - rather than mere consideration - of the planning requirements mandatory, and the FHWA and FTA must take a more aggressive role in ensuring that federal transportation planning mandates are observed by MPOs.

#### Federal oversight key to federal law compliance

Olson 1 (Benjamin K., J.D. from Georgetown University and B.A. from Tulane University, “The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century: The Failure of Metropolitan Planning Organizations to Reform Federal Transportation Policy in Metropolitan Areas,” Transportation Journal, Volume 28, Issue 147, http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/tportl28&div=12&id=&page=)

The current level of federal oversight of the metropolitan transportation planning process provided FHWA and FTA is inadequate to ensure that MPOs are in compliance with the statutory requirements. While judicial review can resolve specific disputes over the adequacy of MPO procedures, strong federal oversight is necessary to ensure that the entire metropolitan transportation planning process complies with federal law. Therefore, the FHWA and FTA should not only take a more aggressive approach in the certification process in order to determine which MPOs are not in compliance, but should also assist those MPOs towards compliance through information sharing with the FHWA and FTA as well as between MPOs.

#### Buses solve and Fed Key (maybe a perm card)

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, <http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809_stranded_at_thestation.PDF>)

Demand for public transportation¶ is at a historic high for the United¶ States. In 2008, Americans¶ took 10.7 billion trips on public¶ transportation, the highest since¶ 1956—the year the Interstate¶ Highway System was approved.1¶ Since 1995, transit ridership has¶ been growing at nearly triple the¶ rate of the population and almost twice as fast as the number of¶ miles driven. In 2008, transit ridership rose four percent, while the¶ total number of miles driven fell by 3.6 percent.2¶ Communities across the country have tried to respond to this demand by planning for new¶ rail lines, launching commuter bus and train services, and expanding bus routes into areas never¶ before served by transit. Rail and rapid bus lines, in turn, have attracted new homes, businesses¶ and offices. These trends are almost universally regarded as positive for local communities, for¶ metro areas and for the nation as a whole.¶ The benefits, certainly, are numerous. They accrue to people from all walks of life: Older¶ Americans (and there are more every day) rely on public transit to remain active and engaged,¶ rather than stranded at home. As gas prices rise along with freeway congestion, drivers are switching¶ to public transportation to save money and frustration. Low-income workers and their families¶ depend on transit to reach jobs and daily necessities.¶ Businesses also benefit, gaining greater access to workers who themselves have more reliable¶ commutes. Fewer commuters clogging the highways can mean more efficient goods movement,¶ as well as cleaner air. Property values in neighborhoods close to quality transit service have held¶ steady or improved, even in this real estate depression, providing a boon to owners and local¶ governments alike. The nation as a whole benefits from reduced reliance on oil imported from¶ volatile parts of the world, with less of our national income sent abroad. And the planet benefits¶ from reduced carbon emissions: More than 30 state climate change action plans call for substantially¶ increased public transportation. The new Administration understands these benefits, too.¶ INTRODUCTION¶ 2¶ STRANDED AT THE STATION¶ The President, his Secretary of Transportation and other officials regularly point to the benefits¶ that public transportation produces for the economy, the environment, and community health.¶ In addition, building and operating transit could be a source of rapid job creation in an economy¶ where jobs are desperately needed.¶ With both the demand and the pay-off so high, now would seem to be the time to build on¶ this success and expand transit options, yet the opposite is happening. State and local budget¶ cuts have put public transit agencies everywhere under tremendous pressure, forcing them to¶ eliminate service, raise fares and lay off workers. While the depth of the funding crisis is the result¶ of the unusually severe economic downturn, the cuts to this essential service underscore a basic¶ truth: The funding base for building and operating public transportation is insufficient and vulnerable.¶ Financial support from states and localities is important, but they cannot do it on their own.¶ As with all transportation systems in the U.S. – whether highways, airports, or transit -- federal¶ policy and funding determine whether any given mode reaches its potential. Currently, the federal¶ government devotes 82 cents of every transportation dollar to roads and 18 percent to public¶ transportation. Federal policy requires local taxpayers to match each federal dollar for public¶ transportation with a dollar of their own, while requiring only a quarter match for roads. The¶ federal government provides formula funding to localities, but does not give them the flexibility¶ to spend it as needs dictate; rather, it requires them to spend on equipment and construction,¶ even if the pressing need is for money to preserve services in an economic downturn.¶ Existing federal policy is out of date and out of touch with today’s realities. Even if Congress¶ were to act today to change policy to enable the preservation of existing service in this economy –¶ and it should – the resources needed to meet rising demand are simply not there. It is encouraging,¶ then, that leaders in the U.S. House have put forward ideas to provide greater flexibility,¶ fairness, and funding in the next six-year transportation law. It is our hope that this report, which¶ provides a national snapshot of the pain being felt by transit riders across the country, will help¶ serve as a catalyst for building a system that realizes the myriad benefits outlined above and creates¶ a robust, resilient transportation network that works for all Americans.

#### Fed Key---their role is critical

Transportation For America 9 (Transportation for America, a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations; seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development, “STRANDED AT THE STATION: THE IMPACT OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION”, August, 2009, http://www.t4america.org/docs/081809\_stranded\_at\_thestation.PDF)

As these stories clearly show, public transportation¶ agencies are doing everything they¶ can to avoid imposing draconian impacts on¶ the riders who rely on them. Already lean in¶ most cases, they are slimming down further¶ through innovative cost savings and taking¶ all prudent measures to weather the current,¶ prolonged storm. These essential service¶ providers are no longer merely cutting¶ “fat” – if there was much, if any, to cut – but¶ are eliminating lifeline services and raising fares for people who can ill¶ afford it, especially now.¶ State and local governments and their taxpayers understand that they are the first line of support.¶ Some are stepping up to fill the budget gaps. But states, in particular, can do more to put¶ their transit systems on a stable footing by providing more money, but also by giving agencies¶ greater flexibility in allocating their resources and in tapping new sources of revenue.¶ The federal government should also play a role in the solution to this problem by providing¶ greater flexibility, fairness, and funding in the next six-year transportation law. Increased federal support for transit and the flexibility to use transit resources more efficiently is critical if we are to realize the mobility, economic, health, and environmental benefits that transit provides. It is our¶ hope that this report, which provides a national snapshot of the pain being felt by transit riders¶ across the country, will help serve as a catalyst for building a system that realizes the myriad¶ benefits outlined above and creates a robust, resilient transportation network that works for all¶ Americans.¶ CONCLUSION¶ STRANDED AT THE STATION

### AT States---TEA Specific

####  Federal involvement key to success of TEA-21

Olson 1 (Benjamin K., J.D. from Georgetown University and B.A. from Tulane University, “The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century: The Failure of Metropolitan Planning Organizations to Reform Federal Transportation Policy in Metropolitan Areas,” Transportation Journal, Volume 28, Issue 147, http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/tportl28&div=12&id=&page=)

Transportation planning decisions in metropolitan areas involving the use of federal funds are made by metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in cooperation with state governments and pursuant to federal requirements. This planning system is the result of two federal statutes -the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) - that sought to reform the pre-existing transportation planning process, which was dominated by state governments and strongly favored automotive transportation, by granting MPOs planning authority over metropolitan areas and by requiring that they consider alternative modes of transportation as well as the impact of their decisions on communities and the environment. This paper argues that these reforms have been unsuccessful because they failed to provide MPOs with sufficient independence from state governments and failed to impose strong planning requirements and federal oversight, which could have counteracted the dependence of MPOs on state governments. Finally, this paper will conclude that changes in the current regime that strengthen MPOs and federal planning requirements as well as active federal oversight are necessary if the transportation planning reforms envisioned by ISTEA and TEA-21 are to become a reality.

#### TEA-21 failed because of state governments

Olson 1 (Benjamin K., J.D. from Georgetown University and B.A. from Tulane University, “The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century: The Failure of Metropolitan Planning Organizations to Reform Federal Transportation Policy in Metropolitan Areas,” Transportation Journal, Volume 28, Issue 147, http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/tportl28&div=12&id=&page=)

To the extent that they impose substantial procedural requirements that demand that states and MPOs actually create long-range transportation plans for metropolitan areas, ISTEA and TEA-21 have been successful in reforming the pre-existing federal transportation policy of unplanned, federally-funded road-building. However, to the extent that they substantively change what kinds of transportation projects are funded and who makes the decision to fund them, ISTEA and TEA-21 have largely failed because metropolitan transportation planning continues to focus on road-building in response to increased vehicular demand and metropolitan transportation policy decisions continue to be made by the state governments, just as they were before ISTEA. In order to give effect to TEA-21, the federal government must take an active role in metropolitan transportation policy in order to ensure that federal funds are used on multimodal transportation systems and that TEA-21 is not rendered an empty promise.

### AT States---MSC Fail

#### Deals will fall apart inevitably – unsustainability

Wayne 9 – New York Times [Leslie, June 4, 2009, “Politics and the Financial Crisis Slow the Drive to Privatize,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/05/business/economy/05private.html?_r=1>]

“We will see a few transactions,” said Fred Pollock, a vice president at Morgan Stanley Infrastructure, a private equity fund. “But we know what we won’t see — a tidal wave of projects.” Some big names still want to enter this business, among them Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley and Kohlberg Kravis Roberts. Such investors have raised about $180 billion for global infrastructure projects. Large funds have also been established in Australia, Britain and Bahrain, where such public-private partnerships are more common. More than 20 states enacted legislation in recent years to allow some form of private-sector investment that would help fill budget gaps and repair crumbling roads, bridges and even airports. But now the deals are falling apart. In April, a much-anticipated $2.5 billion plan to privatize Midway Airport in Chicago collapsed after a group of investors was unable to obtain debt financing. The deal, which had been in the works for four years, was to have been the first in a Federal Aviation Administration project that would have allowed up to five major airports to move into private hands. Midway was just the latest setback. The biggest was the failure last fall of the largest deal proposed to date — a $12.8 billion lease of the Pennsylvania Turnpike to an investor group headed by Citigroup and a Spanish investment firm. Postmortems into that failed effort show that privatization advocates vastly underestimated the political opposition the deal would stir up in the Pennsylvania legislature. Late last month plans to privatize “Alligator Alley,” a 78-mile stretch of Florida highway that connects Fort Lauderdale with Naples, collapsed when no bidders showed up. The failure has had a ripple effect — in Mississippi, state officials have pushed back the bidding schedule for a new 12-mile toll road. Then there is the $1.2 billion privatization of 36,000 parking meters in Chicago. In the five months since the deal took effect, widespread complaints about poor service and rising parking rates have created a political firestorm for the Chicago City Council. Public opposition was so strong that on Wednesday the council approved a delay in voting on any future asset sales. Chicago public officials have called the work of the private operator, Chicago Parking Meters L.L.C., “simply unacceptable.” For its part, the operator has apologized and announced it would delay price increases at the meters. Proponents of public-to-private asset sales point to the $1.8 billion lease of the 7.8-mile Chicago Skyway in 2004 and the $3.8 billion raised by Indiana through a 75-year lease of its toll road in 2006 as successful pioneering efforts. In Indiana, the money went to pay for a 10-year highway infrastructure program, and Gov. Mitch Daniels was re-elected last year promoting the lease, despite bumper stickers that read “Keep the Toll Road, Lease Mitch.” The stimulus money, as well as other infrastructure money promised by Congress, has provided temporary relief for cash-poor municipalities. But this situation will not last forever. “They still have expenses, and revenues will not keep up,” Scott Pattison, executive director of the National Association of State Budget Officers, said of state and local governments. “Some states will have to look at asset sales and decide. Once we step back from this crisis mode, I think they will be looked at again.” If the market revives, the problems that scuttled recent deals may provide some lessons. In the case of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, politics clearly played a role in the deal’s collapse. A study by the Pew Center on the States found that proponents of the deal had overpromised what the turnpike could fetch and had failed to make it clear where the money would go. After indicating that the turnpike might be valued at as much as $26 billion, when the winning $12.8 billion bid came in lawmakers felt it looked too small. Even more, there was concern that the money would be squandered and that the state was putting a valuable asset into foreign hands, since the top bidder included a Spanish company. “It simply wasn’t a sufficient bid by a long shot,” said Joseph F. Markosek, a state legislator and head of the Pennsylvania House Transportation Committee. Similar sentiments are coming into play in Florida, where few had expected Alligator Alley to be leased. “I believe the private partnership is like fool’s gold,” said David Aronberg, a state senator in south Florida who has led the fight against privatization. “It only looks good from afar.”

### AT States---Uniformity Key

#### Lack of Uniformity destroys solvency—perpetuates differences in treatment based on socioeconomic status

**Bullard et al 7** [Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University. He is the author of thirteen books that address sustainable development, environmental racism, urban land use, industrial facility siting, community reinvestment, housing, transportation and smart growth. His book, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality (Westview Press, 2000), is a standard text in the environmental justice field. His most recent books include Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World (Earthscan/MIT Press, 2003), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity (South End Press, 2004), The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution (Sierra Club Books, 2005), Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity (MIT Press, 2007) and The Black Metropolis in the Twenty­First Century: Race, Power and the Politics of Place (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming May 2007). Paul Mohai is Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was an early and major contributor to the growing body of quantitative research examining the disproportionate environmental burdens in low­income and people of color communities. A significant outcome of this early research was the organization of the historic 1990 “Michigan Conference on Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards” with colleague Dr. Bunyan Bryant. Dr. Mohai also has been a major contributor to research examining the environmental attitudes of African Americans and their influence on the environmental movement. His current research involves national­level studies examining cause and effect relationships in the distribution of environmental hazards by race and class, including examining the role environmental factors play in accounting for racial and socioeconomic disparities in health. He is the author of numerous articles on the subject of race and the environment. Robin Saha is Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Montana and affiliated faculty with its School of Public and Community Health Sciences. He is among the leading scholars conducting quantitative studies of environmental inequality using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). His articles appear in leading social science journals including Demography and Social Problems. His teaching and research focuses on the intersection of environmental justice, health and policy with an emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. He is committed to providing assistance to contaminated communities and works actively on tribal environmental issues. One of his current community­based research projects focuses on substandard housing and environmental health on Montana Indian reservations. He also consults on environmental justice legal cases and conducts environmental justice analyses for a wide variety of nonprofit advocacy organizations. Beverly Wright is a sociologist and the founding director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ) at Dillard University (formerly at Xavier University of Louisiana) in New Orleans. She is a leading scholar, advocate and activist in the environmental justice arena. She served on the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for the state of Louisiana and on the city of New Orleans' Select Committee for the Sewerage and Water Board. She is co­chair of the National Black Environmental Justice Network and the Environmental Justice Climate Change (EJCC) Initiative. She is the co­author of In the Wake of the Storm: Environment, Disaster and Race after Katrina (Russell Sage Foundation, May 2006). She is a native of New Orleans and a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty 1987—2007”, <http://www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/toxic20.pdf>, March 2007] SV

The nation's environmental laws, regulations and policies are not applied uniformly—resulting in some individuals, neighborhoods and communities being exposed to elevated health risks. In 1992, staff writers from the National Law Journal uncovered glaring inequities in the way the federal EPA enforces its laws. The authors write: There is a racial divide in the way the U.S. government cleans up toxic waste sites and punishes polluters. White communities see faster action, better results and stiffer penalties than communities where blacks, Hispanics and other minorities live. This unequal protection often occurs whether the community is wealthy or poor. 1 These findings suggest that unequal protection is placing communities of color at special risk. The National Law Journal study supplements the findings of earlier studies and reinforces what many grassroots leaders have been saying all along: Not only are people of color differentially impacted by industrial pollution, they also can expect different treatment from the government. Environmental decision making operates at the juncture of science, economics, politics, special interests and ethics.

### AT States---Perm

#### Federal and State government cooperation is key to reducing spatial inequality.

Kim, 2k8 (Sukkoo, Associate Professor, Department of Economics UCLA, Economic History; Urban and Regional Economics; Trade and Development ,“Spatial Inequality and Economic Development: Theories, Facts and Policies” https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:wm0xC4ZyVu8J:www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/kim\_final\_draft.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjEtZgJt4maAQXU7At0qH\_d6skw73SUk1JBRHjSLLFc1EQzvvJUahEmJkZaTfibs8Qq8BW4R346hQGNxlBWVmtBQ79ZOVylFk112mCYbC1ElO1EEmb5ugvpWMA-ZukxiWqkyGi2&sig=AHIEtbTf2vSCCjxg9M1XO5gWyBYFu19gJA&pli=1, March 2008)

Fourth, political institutions can play a significant role in determining regional and urban inequality. Differences in regional institutions may cause divergence in regional economies. Dictatorships, political weakness, and centralized power seem to contribute to a centralized urban population. In general, the distribution of political and fiscal power between federal, state and local governments can significantly influence regional as well as urban spatial inequality. Different jurisdictions of government have different political incentives and are likely to prefer different levels of public goods that impact spatial inequality.

### AT EIS CP

#### EIS is normal means // EIS only serves to reify the system of Environmental Racism

**Hogen 4** [Talli Hogen, Environmental Science UC Berkeley, “Highly classified…public information? Environmental racism in environmental impact statements”, <http://nature.berkeley.edu/classes/es196/projects/2004final/Hogan.pdf>, 2004] SV

Abstract Federal law requires environmental impact statements (EISs) for agencies involved in any action that could significantly impact the environment. Enacted in 1994, Executive Order 12898 required that EISs ensure that minority populations are not disproportionately affected by adverse environmental impacts. This study addresses environmental racism issues in the structure of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) EISs, and how attention to these issues has changed with time and with proportion of minorities in the affected communities. I expect that the quality of all EISs has improved over the past 25 years, but that EISs for high percentage minority communities are still of lower quality. Data was collected using a checklist, with criteria that check for environmental racism; documentation on publication year and demographic statistics was included. Higher scores denote better attention to potential environmental racism issues. N=40 for the years 1980-2004. EIS scores appeared to be highly correlated to the date of publication (ANOVA, α=0.05), but not to the percentages of minorities in the communities affected. Overall, EIS scores have increased over time. Score improvement since 1994 is increasingly greater (z-test, α=0.05) with a larger percentage of minorities in the affected population. Certain areas, such as inclusion of racial census information, and involving community members in developing mitigation measures, still need improvement. Caltrans has achieved equalization of environmental justice scores among different population types affected, although environmental justice scores were generally still fairly low. Attention to some specific issues, such as public access to the documents, was found to be insufficient.

### AT Market

#### Conventional-market cost-benefit analysis systematically discards the needs of the poor---government intervention is a necessary corrective

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

Transport sector operations do have important direct impacts on the poor. In particular, some problems inherent in the transport project evaluation process and in transport market structures often adversely affect the poor more than the rich. Because these adverse impacts on the poor contribute to both relative poverty and absolute poverty, heightened awareness on these distributive impacts is very important for appreciating the contribution of the transport sector to poverty reduction. This awareness needs to be translated in systematic manner into the formulation of national transport policies and investment programs, and into the selection and design of transport development projects. Unfortunately, there have been very few studies of the distributive impact of transport in general, and transport operations in particular. The consequences for the poor of transport projects, external effects, and government regulations have not been adequately documented. 4.30 Conventional cost-benefit analysis does not take distributive impact into account and hence does not inform government decision-makers of the social groups that stand to gain and lose as a result of their decisions. Nor does it inform decision-makers of the effect of projects on poverty reduction. In addition, since cost-benefit analysis involves adding the gains and losses to all affected groups on the same basis, it may be argued that it involves a selection orientation against low-income groups. To overcome this orientation, one approach is to introduce distributional weights that assign different weights to money gains or losses to different income groups. In general, this approach is not appropriate. Distributional judgments should be resolved through political processes. However, these processes can be assisted in a rigorous way by extending the conventional cost-benefit analysis framework to cover distributional outcomes and to display this information in a balance sheet format as an adjunct to the conventional cost benefit analysis. Analysis of distributive outcomes can be difficult, however. The practical extent to which it can be undertaken needs to be judged carefully; for example, a strong(er) case prevails in situations where the distributive outcome is likely to differ significantly across alternatives, and especially where there is little difference in efficiency among alternatives.

#### The market continually disadvantages the poor---inevitable human and mkt error discourage private investment

Gannon and Liu 97 (Colin Gannon and Zhi Liu, Zhi Liu Lead is an infrastructure Specialist, East Asia and Pacific Region, World Bank, Beijing; Colin Gannon is senior transport economist at the World Bank, “Poverty and Transport”, September, 1997, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/twu-30.pdf)

4.19 Other forms of market failure also tend to be relatively regressive. High transport costs limit access to suppliers of products and services, inhibit information flows, increase uncertainty and reinforce credit market failures. Many transport services are complementary (for example, feeder/main services and interconnecting modes), and under different ownership or management, coordination problems arise (for example, meshing schedules, hours of operation, and common terminal facilities). Both of these forms of market failure tend to discourage private investment and result in higher prices. As a user group, the poor are likely to be the most disadvantaged. There is a potential role for the public sector in ameliorating these forms of market failure, for example, by facilitating coordination for operations and adopting a leadership role or brokerage for terminals (to reduce risks associated with the high sunk costs).

### AT Market/Privatization

#### Private actors don’t solve – won’t help the most needy citizens

CCGA 10 – The Chicago Council on Global Affairs is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning [September 2010, “No Free Money: Is the Privatization of Infrastructure in the Public Interest?” <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Emerging%20Leaders%20Program/ELReport2010_Privatization.pdf>, Page 29-30 ]

2. privatization may have social implications, adversely affecting certain groups. The primary benefit of privatization lies in the efficiencies of the private sector. Profit-seeking firms have a powerful incentive to increase revenues and reduce costs. This incentive, usually a good thing, can turn out to have adverse social consequences when certain kinds of public assets are put in private hands. First, a private operator may cut costs by taking actions that harm a vulnerable segment of society, such as low-income citizens. For example, an efficient operator will cut money-losing services (e.g. bus routes to certain neighborhoods) and purge customers who aren’t profitable. The subsequent reduction in service may cut off workers from their jobs or eliminate some basic service for the most needy. Second, private operators may act in ways that create costs that spill over into the public sector. Take the example of a privatized toll road whose operator has leeway in setting use fees. It is understood that levying tolls on highways will alter driver behavior and road usage. Transportation research has shown that, in the face of rising toll costs, drivers’ route selection is highly elastic, meaning that many will modify their choice of routes when confronted by relatively small increases in fees. 21 Some motorists will detour onto public roads that do not charge tolls. As drivers opt to reroute their travel, congestion levels on other roadways will increase, leading to rising costs for other drivers in the form of longer commute times and higher public costs for road maintenance and repair. Third, making a good asset more popular, and thereby increasing revenues, may not always be in society’s best interest. Consider the case of a lottery privatization. A private operator can improve the “efficiency” of the lottery by making it more popular. Revenues will go up. However, low-income citizens buy a disproportionate share of lottery tickets, so that a more popular lottery will essentially transfer income away from some of society’s neediest citizens, leaving any resulting social problems for the public sector to fix. 22 Finally, a private operator may maximize profits by limiting competition, which was the case with the British Airport Authority, which had a disincentive to invest in expanding capacity, thereby boosting profits at the expense of airport congestion (a cost borne by weary travelers). In fact, BAA invested heavily in airport retail, creating at least the appearance of a misaligned incentive, since stranded travelers have more time to shop.

#### Err on the side of caution – if they screw up there’s no going back

CCGA 10 – The Chicago Council on Global Affairs is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning [September 2010, “No Free Money: Is the Privatization of Infrastructure in the Public Interest?” <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Emerging%20Leaders%20Program/ELReport2010_Privatization.pdf>, Page 29]

1. Privatization constrains future options. By definition, privatization places a public asset in private control for some period of time, if not indefinitely. A privatization contract can be written to demand all kinds of performance measures—but only those that can be anticipated at the time the contract is written. A lot can change in twenty or fifty or ninety-nine years; the public has little control over a private entity that is adhering to a contract that is valid but nonetheless outdated because it no longer reflects what the public desires or expects. 20 In contrast, an elected government controlling a public asset is always accountable to voters. If those citizens decide that they want something different with respect to an asset (because of changes in technology, lifestyle, demographics, or anything else), then the government is unhindered in its ability to cater to those evolving preferences.

#### Government oversight is inevitable

CCGA 10 – The Chicago Council on Global Affairs is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning [September 2010, “No Free Money: Is the Privatization of Infrastructure in the Public Interest?” <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Emerging%20Leaders%20Program/ELReport2010_Privatization.pdf>, Page 34 ]

5. Private entities may fail to fulfill contractual obligations. A privatization contract is only as good as its monitoring and enforcement. Privatization is built upon “contractible quality,” meaning that the contract explicitly specifies what is expected of the private operator in terms of quality and service levels, among other issues. Contracts do not enforce themselves. Government must devote resources to overseeing privatization contracts and must have a strategy in place in case a private firm does not or cannot fulfill its contractual obligations. In the case of the Chicago Skyway, a private firm that was awarded the concession to operate a rest area has run into solvency issues and can no longer fulfill its obligations. Yet motorists still need a safe place to stop on the Skyway—something that government is expected, once again, to provide. This ongoing oversight role is a critical part of a privatization agreement and needs to be given sufficient budget and staff support: The costs of monitoring must be considered in any costs-benefit calculus, not just the headline proceeds.

### AT Market/Privatization---Links to Elections

#### Lack of input on the privatization angers constituents

CCGA 10 – The Chicago Council on Global Affairs is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning [September 2010, “No Free Money: Is the Privatization of Infrastructure in the Public Interest?” <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/Emerging%20Leaders%20Program/ELReport2010_Privatization.pdf>, Page 34-35 ]

6. A Lack of public Input A lack of public input—real or perceived—at any point in the privatization process can compromise the outcome and leave citizens deeply disaffected. In theory, any government is designed to represent the voice of its citizens; in practice, privatization may demand public input above and beyond the normal processes of government at every step in the process. Even a “good” privatization deal in a financial sense will generate public consternation and distrust if there is a lingering belief that it did not reflect the public will. Process matters. Every step of a privatization deal must be perceived as fair, transparent, and inclusive. The ends will not justify the means, since there is no obvious metric for quantifying the success of a privatization agreement (unlike the private sector, in which a good return on investment can redeem even the sloppiest deal). If anything, a poor public process can poison a deal that makes sense in every other respect.

#### Privatization angers voters – ridiculous charges to maintain profit

Wayne 9 – New York Times [Leslie, June 4, 2009, “Politics and the Financial Crisis Slow the Drive to Privatize,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/05/business/economy/05private.html?_r=1>]

It was hailed as a win-win for Main Street and Wall Street — a way for states and cities, along with financiers, to make some money. But now privatization, the selling of public airports, bridges, roads and the like to private investors, looks like a boom that wasn’t. Deals are collapsing. Airy hopes of quick profits are vanishing. And what was celebrated as a new wave in finance is, for the moment, barely making a ripple. What happened? The financial crisis, for starters. The easy money that Wall Street was counting on to finance its purchases has largely disappeared. Then the Obama administration unintentionally damped interest with its $787 billion economic stimulus package, a windfall that local governments are now racing to spend. Bankers concede they got a bit ahead of themselves. When times were good, investment banks and private investment funds raised billions of dollars in hopes of buying infrastructure. But many state and local governments resisted selling because of money, politics or both. Some deals turned out to be less lucrative than these would-be sellers had hoped. Government officials also began questioning whether taxpayers would be better off if infrastructure were in private hands. After Chicago sold its parking system to a private operator, for instance, drivers had to feed meters with as many as 28 quarters to park for two hours.

### AT Cap K

#### Capitalism/Wealth Disparities are not the root cause of environmental racism

**Bullard et al 7** [Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University. He is the author of thirteen books that address sustainable development, environmental racism, urban land use, industrial facility siting, community reinvestment, housing, transportation and smart growth. His book, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class and Environmental Quality (Westview Press, 2000), is a standard text in the environmental justice field. His most recent books include Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World (Earthscan/MIT Press, 2003), Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism and New Routes to Equity (South End Press, 2004), The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution (Sierra Club Books, 2005), Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice and Regional Equity (MIT Press, 2007) and The Black Metropolis in the Twenty­First Century: Race, Power and the Politics of Place (Rowman & Littlefield, forthcoming May 2007). Paul Mohai is Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was an early and major contributor to the growing body of quantitative research examining the disproportionate environmental burdens in low­income and people of color communities. A significant outcome of this early research was the organization of the historic 1990 “Michigan Conference on Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards” with colleague Dr. Bunyan Bryant. Dr. Mohai also has been a major contributor to research examining the environmental attitudes of African Americans and their influence on the environmental movement. His current research involves national­level studies examining cause and effect relationships in the distribution of environmental hazards by race and class, including examining the role environmental factors play in accounting for racial and socioeconomic disparities in health. He is the author of numerous articles on the subject of race and the environment. Robin Saha is Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Montana and affiliated faculty with its School of Public and Community Health Sciences. He is among the leading scholars conducting quantitative studies of environmental inequality using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). His articles appear in leading social science journals including Demography and Social Problems. His teaching and research focuses on the intersection of environmental justice, health and policy with an emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. He is committed to providing assistance to contaminated communities and works actively on tribal environmental issues. One of his current community­based research projects focuses on substandard housing and environmental health on Montana Indian reservations. He also consults on environmental justice legal cases and conducts environmental justice analyses for a wide variety of nonprofit advocacy organizations. Beverly Wright is a sociologist and the founding director of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ) at Dillard University (formerly at Xavier University of Louisiana) in New Orleans. She is a leading scholar, advocate and activist in the environmental justice arena. She served on the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for the state of Louisiana and on the city of New Orleans' Select Committee for the Sewerage and Water Board. She is co­chair of the National Black Environmental Justice Network and the Environmental Justice Climate Change (EJCC) Initiative. She is the co­author of In the Wake of the Storm: Environment, Disaster and Race after Katrina (Russell Sage Foundation, May 2006). She is a native of New Orleans and a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty 1987—2007”, <http://www.ucc.org/assets/pdfs/toxic20.pdf>, March 2007] SV

Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States found race to be more important than socioeconomic status in predicting the location of the nation’s commercial hazardous waste facilities. Thus, it is appropriate to ask whether racial disparities reported above in the current distribution of hazardous wastes are a function of neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics. Because race is often highly correlated with socioeconomic status, it is difficult to tell if race plays an independent role in accounting for facility locations without conducting statistical tests (i.e., multivariate analyses) to isolate the effect of race alone. To determine the independent effect of race, socioeconomic factors believed to be associated with race must be statistically controlled. A number of income, occupation, employment and education variables were selected to serve as indicators of neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics (see Methods Appendix). Table 4.7 shows the results of the multivariate analysis with the race and socioeconomic variables separately grouped. All race variables (percentages of Hispanics, African Americans and Asians/Pacific Islanders) are highly significant independent predictors of the facility locations (at the 0.000 level). The positive coefficient (B) indicates that the higher the people of color percentages, the more likely a census tract is to be within 3 kilometers of a commercial hazardous waste facility. Among the indicators of socioeconomic status, mean income and percent employed in blue collar occupations are significant predictors (at the 0.000 level). These variables are therefore independently associated with hazardous waste facility locations. Mean housing value is statistically significant, but in an unexpected direction (i.e., it has a positive coefficient). Some socioeconomic variables are not statistically significant. For example, the percentage employed in management and professional (i.e., white collar) occupations is not a significant predictor. Likewise, the percentage of persons with a college degree does not quite achieve the threshold needed to be considered statistically significant, though it is trending that way. It also has a positive coefficient, which is in the unexpected direction. The results show that race continues to be a significant and robust predictor of commercial hazardous waste facility locations when socioeconomic and other non­racial factors are taken into account. A separate analysis of metropolitan areas alone produces similar results (see Appendix 4.10).

#### The aff violates traditional capitalist rules---redrawing spatial lines breaks-down profit-driven politics

Gough et al 6 (James, senior lecturer in town and regional planning at Sheffield university, Aram Eisenschitz, senior lecturer in the school of health and social science at Middlesex university, Andrew McCulloch, senior lecturer at northumbria university, Spaces of Social Exclusion, p. 65, JG)

Capitalist towns and cities separate different income groups by area. The market in housing, whether rented or owner occupied, combined with people's wish to live with (at least) their "social equals' and in the best possible physical environment, tend to create single-income neighbourhoods and districts. This is a dynamic process: when a household's incomes rises it tends to move to a 'better' area, producing successions of newly desirable areas on the one hand and neighbourhoods abandoned to investment on the other. Thus, since the eighteenth century, the poor have been largely confined within their own neighbourhoods. Segregation has been moderated, however, by the sometimes slow pace of movement of the better off, by poor people living at high densities in high rent accommodation, and by older, good-quality housing having a complex spatial distribution, In British and {somewhat later) US cities the pattern has been of outward movement of the better off to newly-built suburbs: the rich from the eighteenth century, the middle class from the early nineteenth century, the better-off working class from the late nineteenth century through to the 1950s. Social democratic reformers from the Garden City movement through to post-Second World War planners saw the leafy suburb as a solution not just to the housing problems of the poor but to poverty in all its forms (section 2.5). But the poor could not afford the housing costs of the suburbs nor the costs and time of commuting, and thus remained in their old areas. In consequence, by the 1960s inner city areas were largely poorStale intervention has actually reinforced these divisions. In both Britain and the USA suburban expansion has received state subsidy (infrastructures, tax relief on mortgages) (Walker. 1981). bind use planning has mi maximum densities and restrictions on conversion, ensuring that (he neighbourhood cannot be cheapened by builders. In Britain, as elsewhere in Western Furope, public housing has been built mostly in large estates sited on cheap land, either in old working class areas or (more common on the continent) on peripheral green field sites. In Britain this was effected partly by the refusal of better off suburban authorities to build council housing, and partly by central government funding regimes favouring high rise as experiments in the industrialisation of building. The majority of public housing has thus been in distinct thus lower income—neighbourhoods, mirroring market patterning. The residualisation of council housing since the 1980s has then automatically led to the creation of (Increasingly) poor neighbourhoods, exacerbated by the disproportionate sale of council housing located in higher Income areas. The outcome of these market and state processes is strong spatial concentration of the poor In contemporary Britain (section 3.6; Wadhams, 2002). Spatial concentration of the poor is deepened for black and minority ethnic groups by racism. The extreme 'racial' segregation in the USA is well known: many African-purchases, become linked lo status: poor youths who take a car without the owner's consent are seeking to use a commodity with higli status as well as high speed; conversely, bus and most rail transport now has low status. Second, commercially viable, and efficient, public transport needs coordination across the city-region; this means cross-subsidy between routes and planning them, which go against the capitalist logic of their individual profitability. Third, private investors in employment, consumer services, commercial space and housing do not have to coordinate their sites with public transport. As car-owning workers and consumers are the Important ones for investors, sites become increasingly dispersed and journeys longer. In 1952 people travelled on average 86km per week; 50 years later this was 251km (Department for Transport. 2003). Dispersion of sites then makes jobs, services and residential areas harder to serve by public transport In a further vicious circle. The poor's lack of mobility thus derives from capitalist production dynamics in transport and the built environment, including the lack of spatial coordination In investment- and from the dominance of private household consumption. The state potentially can Improve accessibility through regulation of transport and land use; but it has to do so in the face of these fundamental capitalist relations.

#### The aff solves – their author

Kim 8 (Sukko, ociate Professor of Economics Research Associate at Wash U, Spatial Inequality and Economic Development: Theories, Facts, and Policies, <http://soks.wustl.edu/spatial_inequality.pdf>, JG)

This section examines the policy implications that emerge from the review of the recent contributions on spatial inequality presented above. While the literature does not provide a guide on defining a list of specific policy recommendations for reducing “excessive” spatial inequality or increasing “beneficial” spatial inequality, the literature does provide some general guidelines and lessons. First, it may be possible to identify the proximate causes of spatial inequality by studying the trends in regional industrial economy. One of the most consistent empirical findings in the literature on spatial inequality is the industrial patterns of localization and dispersion, especially based on the study of developed countries. For these nations, there seems to be a fairly robust and consistent industrial pattern of spatial agglomerations or spatial inequality. Consistent with this finding is the idea that industry localization economies (within‐industry spillovers) are generally more important than urbanization economies (across‐industry spillovers). Thus, at least in principle, policy makers may be able to influence spatial inequality by targeting industry‐specific subsidies or infrastructural investments. From the broad sectoral perspective, the most geographically concentrated industries tend to be extractive industries, such as agriculture and mining, followed by manufacturing, and then services, which tends to be most dispersed. Within the manufacturing sector, studies on industry localization of the United States, United Kingdom, France, and the E.U., as well as many developing countries, suggest that traditional industries such as textiles and apparel are much more likely to be spatially localized whereas the medium‐ to high‐tech industries are much more likely to be dispersed. Numerous studies also find that localization rather than urbanization economies seem more significant for both developed as well as developing countries (Henderson, 1988, 2003; Rosenthal and Strange, 2003; Wheaton and Lewis, 2002).21However, since there is little general consensus on which source of agglomeration economies is most important, the literature provides less of a guide to policy makers as to which type of specific policies might be most effective in fostering or reducing spatial inequality. If technological spillovers or labor‐matching economies are important, then policy makers may pursue policies that encourage information exchanges in ideas or jobs. On the other hand, if market size is important, then it may be more effective to implement policies that foster the growth of markets. A review of the literature suggests that a wide variety of agglomeration economies may be at work in generating spatial inequalities. Despite the recent advances in empirical work in economic geography, scholars have not converged on which source of agglomeration economies are most important (Rosenthal and Strange, 2004; Overman and Venables, 2005).22 While the nature of the evidence varies somewhat, there seems to be strong reasons to believe that agglomeration economies are temporally persistent and dynamic. Thus, policies, if successful, may have persistent influences over time. For the United States, Glaeser and Maré (2001) find that the urban wage premium is higher for long‐time urban residents and Henderson (2003) finds that U.S. high‐tech firms benefit from the scale of past activity. For Japan, Dekle (2002) finds that dynamic externalities measured using total factor productivity growth at the prefecture‐level exist for the finance, services, and wholesale and retail trade industries but not for the manufacturing industries between 1975 and 1995.

Reducing spatial mis-match solves the link

Sampaio 3 (Clarissa, Architect, Federal University of Ceará, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Urban Planning in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INCREASED SOCIOSPATIAL INEQUALITIES IN FORTALEZA, BRAZIL: THE ROLE OF PLANNING, <http://www.urban.illinois.edu/academic> programs/mup/capstones/example\_capstones/Urban%20Development\_Miraftab\_03.pdf, JG)

Changes in the urban geography are able to affect social relations in a myriad of ways. A given segregation pattern can contribute to marginalizing ethical minority populations, or foster integration and assimilation, for example. Cities designed with excessive emphasis on automobile transportation can isolate those without access to cars, and even affect the health of the residents. I’ll focus on the socio-economic effects of urban development specifically because 4 they have been the main urban contradiction in the empirical case of Fortaleza. Urban spatial development has denied economically vulnerable families access to job opportunities brought by local economic growth. Based on this discussion, the central question of this research is the following: How can urban spatial development influence the socio-economic life-chances of the residents? The case of Fortaleza will demonstrate that a new pattern of infrastructure investments in specific strategic sites within the city has profoundly changed the local spatial structure, making access to the city more difficult for the urban poor. The close connection of changes in the local economy with politico-economic developments happening at the global scale often leads popular wisdom to refer to “globalization” as the main factor of heightened socio-spatial inequalities that Fortaleza has been experiencing. The current analysis will demonstrate how increased inequality is not the result of abstract and unavoidable globalization forces, and how they are, instead, contingent upon the attitudes of local actors in placing investments in the intra-urban space.

#### Cap isn't the root cause

Sampaio 3 (Clarissa, Architect, Federal University of Ceará, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Urban Planning in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INCREASED SOCIOSPATIAL INEQUALITIES IN FORTALEZA, BRAZIL: THE ROLE OF PLANNING, <http://www.urban.illinois.edu/academic> programs/mup/capstones/example\_capstones/Urban%20Development\_Miraftab\_03.pdf, JG)

Because both these theoretical traditions (urban economy and ecology) did not recognize urban geography as the product of social relations they tended to undermine both social and spatial inequalities existent in a given city. Urban Ecology and Economic theories overtly described the city as an equilibrated entity implicitly denying the existence (and relevance) of intra-urban differentials. According to these theories, it was only a matter of time for the market to even out any existing urban imbalances. For instance, the Burgess Model defined the decaying zone near downtown as a zone in transition, which would develop and increase its value as soon as the urban core needed room to grow. By using the term “zone in transition” they implied that poverty and decay of some neighborhoods was a temporary problem. Reinforcing this notion of an equilibrated city, urban neoclassical economic studies, claimed that external interference in the balance between supply and demand for land would decrease efficiency and lead to non-optimal. Indeed, urban economics remains dominant in thefield of urban studies although contemporary research admits the possibility of State intervention in the land market in cases of “market failures” or “externalities” (see, for instance, Brueckner, 19993). The fact that redistributive goals are put out of scope of these economic studies allows them to rely on a notion of the city as a balanced entity.

### NEG / FW

#### Hopefully this card means something

PPS 6/6 (Project for Public Spaces, roject for Public Spaces (PPS) is a nonprofit planning, design and educational organization dedicated to helping people create and sustain public spaces that build stronger communities, “How “Small Change” Leads to Big Change: Social Capital and Healthy Places”, June 6, 2012, http://www.pps.org/how-small-change-leads-to-big-change-social-capital-and-healthy-places/)

According to Dr. Richard Jackson, a pioneering public health advocate and former CDC official now serving as the Chair of Environmental Health Sciences at UCLA, the idea that buildings, streets, and public spaces play a key role in the serious public health issues that we face in the US “has undergone a profound sea change in the past few years. It’s gone from sort of a marginal, nutty thing to becoming something that’s common sense for a lot of people.”¶ That’s good news, but as a profile of Dr. Jackson in the Chronicle of Higher Education notes, today’s click-driven media climate means that the message of public health advocates like Jackson is “often pithily condensed to a variation of this eye-catching headline: ‘Suburbia Makes You Fat.’” And while these pithily-titled articles may do some good in alerting more people to the problems inherent in the way that we’ve been designing our cities and towns for the past half-century, they oversimplify the message and strip out one of the most important factors in any effort to change the way that we shape the places where we live and work: social capital.¶ Highways, parking lots, cars, big box stores–these are merely symptoms of a larger problem: many people have become so used to their surroundings looking more like a suburban arterial road than a compact, multi-use destination that they’ve become completely disconnected from Place. Real life is lived amongst gas stations and golden arches; we have to visit Disneyland to see a thriving, compact Main Street. To question a condition that’s so pervasive, as individuals, seems futile.¶ Bikers and walkers chat at a market in Portland, OR / Photo: npGREENWAY via Flickr¶ That’s why, if we want to see people challenging the way that their places are made on a larger scale, we need to focus first on developing the loose social networks that are so vital to urban resilience. This is the stuff Jane Jacobs was talking about when she wrote, in the Death and Life of Great American Cities, that “lowly, unpurposeful, and random as they appear, sidewalk contacts are the small change from which a city’s wealth of public life must grow.” When people are connected enough to feel comfortable talking about what they want for their neighborhood with their neighbors, it’s much easier to muster political will to stop, say, a highway from cutting through Greenwich Village–or, in contemporary terms, to tear down a highway that was actually built.¶ In Dr. Jackson’s words: “The key thing is to get the social engagement. Community-building has to happen first; people need to articulate what’s broke, and then what they want.” Serendipitously, gathering to discuss a vision for a healthier future is an ideal way to build the social capital needed to turn the understanding that our built environment is hurting us into action to change the existing paradigm. At PPS, we have seen first-hand how the Placemaking process has brought people together in hundreds of cities around the world with the goal of improving shared public spaces; it’s a process that strengthens existing ties, creates new ones, and invigorates communities with the knowledge of how they can make things happen.¶ The Healthy Places Program (HPP), which began last year as a collaboration between staff members working in PPS’s Public Markets and Transportation programs. “There are many different elements that make up a healthy community,” says Aurash Khawarzad, an Associate in PPS’s Transportation division, and a key player in getting HPP off the ground. “There are social factors, environmental factors, etc–and what we at PPS can do is take these people in our offices who are focusing on their own areas and bring them together.”¶ Aurash Khawarzad leads a Healthy Places workshop in upstate New York / Photo: PPS¶ With that collaborative mission in mind, Khawarzad and Kelly Verel, a Senior Associate in PPS’s Public Markets division, set out on a trip across New York last fall to facilitate a series of day-long Healthy Places workshops with local, regional, and state public health officials and a host of community partners. In partnership with the New York Academy of Medicine’s DASH-NY, the PPS team visited a range of communities, from rural towns, to suburban stretches, to major and mid-sized cities. The workshops were designed to help participants understand how multi-modal transportation systems can be better designed to create a network that links a series of destinations, including healthy food hubs and markets, to create a built environment that promotes well-being by making healthy lifestyle choices (like walking, biking, and eating fresh food) more convenient and fun. They focused not just on what wasn’t working, but on brainstorming ways that participants’ communities could become truly healthy places.¶ Any expert worth their salt will tell you that maintaining good health is not just about exercise or diet, but both together. In much the same way, addressing the problem of bad community design and its impacts on Public Health requires that we not just promote better transportation or better food access alone, but that we focus on both simultaneously. “The reaction we got from the the Healthy Places training attendees was really good,” notes Verel. “I think people have been really siloed in their efforts. We would ask people what they were doing and they would say ‘access to food in schools,’ or ‘rails to trails,’ and that they focus exclusively on that area.”¶ Understanding public health within the context of Place is essential, because the problems created and reinforced by our built environment are so broad in scope. HPP takes that case directly to local decision-makers and creates a learning environment where they can build their understanding of how Place effects health together, in a cross-disciplinary setting. This “silo-busting” is absolutely critical; as Dr. Jackson writes in the introduction to his latest book, Designing Healthy Communities (a companion to the four-part PBS special of the same name):¶ “For too long we have had doctors talking only to doctors, and urban planners, architects, and builders talking only to themselves. The point is that all of us, including those in public health, have got to get out of the silos we have created, and we have got to connect—actually talk to each other before and while we do our work—because there is no other way we can create the environment we want. Public health in particular must be interdisciplinary, for no professional category owns public health or is legitimately excused from it.”¶ The emphasis, there, is added, as this phrase strike at the heart of the problem we face. To shift the default development model from “low-density, use-segregated, and auto-centric” to one that promotes healthy, active lifestyles and more vibrant communities will take strong leadership from people who aren’t afraid to work across departments, and “turn everything upside-down to get it right side up.” PPS is certainly not the only organization to recognize this, and we’re thrilled to be part of a growing movement. In the US, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has its own Healthy Community Design Initiative program. Internationally, Urban Age made designing for public health the subject of a major conference in Hong Kong held late last year (from which a full report is now available).¶ New bike lanes are just one part of Pro Walk / Pro Bike: "Pro Place" host city Long Beach, CA's strategy to become "Biketown USA" / Photo: waltarrrrr via Flickr¶ Of course, individual citizens have hardly been waiting around and twiddling their thumbs. Active transportation, healthy food, and community gardening advocates have been working for decades on the ground, pushing for incremental changes to the way our cities and towns operate. Just through the robust conversations taking place online around issues like #completestreets, #biking, and #urbanag, it’s easy to see how well-organized and resonant these movements have become. Mounting public awareness is pushing more public officials toward programs like HPP, to learn about how focusing on Place can facilitate inter-agency collaboration around the common cause of improving public health.¶ Whether you’re looking at this issue from the top-down or the bottom-up, there will be several opportunities to gather with active transportation and public markets professionals, advocates, and enthusiasts from around the world this fall for debate, discussion, and more of that vital social capital development. As part of the Healthy Places Program, PPS is hosting two conferences, just one week apart: the 17th Pro Walk / Pro Bike: “Pro Place” conference in Long Beach, CA (Sept. 10-13); and the 8th International Public Markets Conference in Cleveland, OH (Sept. 21-23).¶ Cleveland, which will host the 8th International Public Markets Conference in September, is home to the historic, bustling West Side Market / Photo: Catherine V via Flickr¶ If you’re approaching Healthy Places from the transportation world, Pro Walk / Pro Bike (#prowalkprobike) will explore how efforts to advocate for safer and better infrastructure for active transportation modes are being greatly enhanced as more and more people learn about the benefits of getting around on their own two feet (with or without pedals). If you’re more of a “foodie,” the Public Markets conference (#marketsconf8) will highlight the burgeoning local food scene in Cleveland and throughout Northeastern Ohio, and will spotlight the iconic West Side Market, arguably the most architecturally significant market building in the US. Both events will focus on how supporters of active transportation and public markets, respectively, can grow their movements by busting down silos and thinking h0listically about how their chosen cause can be part of the effort to create Healthy Places.¶ If you can’t make it to Long Beach or Cleveland, there are plenty of Lighter, Quicker, Cheaper steps that you can take to get your neighbors together and talking, out in public space, building local connections. “Something like a playstreet or a summer street shows people that, not only do they like this kind of varied activity and flexibility and want more of it in their community’s streets, but that they can actually make it happen,” Verel explains. “It takes more basic manpower–putting up tents, handing out flyers–than actual lobbying or money to get the DOT to shut down a street for one day and focus on social interaction and healthy activity.”¶ And you can start even smaller than that. PPS mentor Holly Whyte once wrote that “We are not hapless beings caught in the grip of forces we can do little about, and wholesale damnations of our society only lend a further mystique to organization. Organization has been made by man; it can be changed by man.” If our problem is that we have become siloed and isolated, at work and in our neighborhoods, then the most immediate way for us to start re-organizing is to reach out to the people around us, with something as simple as a friendly “hello” on the street. An interaction like this might seem ‘lowly, unpurposeful, and random’–but at the very least, it will make you feel happier and more connected to your community. And guess what? That’s good for you, too.¶ So, here’s to your health!

#### Poor access and transportation ensure the poor stay in poverty

World Bank 2 (World Bank, international financial institution that provides loans to countries for capital programs; their main goal is the reduction of poverty, “CITIES ON THE MOVE”, 2002, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTURBANTRANSPORT/Resources/cities\_on\_the\_move.pdf)

Poor people’s inability to access jobs and services is an important element of the social exclusion that defines urban poverty. Urban transport policy can attenuate¶ this poverty, both by contributing to economic growth and by introducing a conscious poverty reduction focus to infrastructure investment, to public¶ transport service planning, and to fare-subsidy and financing strategies. There is a rich agenda of urban transport policies that are both pro-growth and pro-poor,¶ yet which are consistent with the fiscal capabilities of even the poorest countries. URBAN POVERTY AND¶ SOCIAL EXCLUSION¶ Poor households derive their standard of living¶ from a variety of activities, not all of which are marketed¶ or assigned a monetary value. That standard¶ of living, and its security, depends not only¶ on current income but also on the stock of assets,¶ including the social and human capital, as well as¶ the money and physical assets, at the disposal of¶ the household. Poverty is thus a multidimensional¶ concept involving the lack of the social and cultural,¶ as well as economic, means necessary to¶ procure a minimum level of nutrition, to participate¶ in the everyday life of society, and to ensure¶ economic and social reproduction.1 In this general¶ notion of poverty as “exclusion,” accessibility¶ is important, not only for its role in facilitating¶ regular and stable income-earning employment¶ but also for its role as part of the social capital¶ that maintains the social relations forming the¶ safety net of poor people in many societies.¶ Deteriorating urban transport conditions have a¶ particularly severe impact on poor people.2¶ Growing reliance on private vehicles has resulted¶ in a substantial fall in the share of, and in some¶ cases an absolute decline in the number of, trips¶ made by urban public transport in many cities.¶ Consequently there has been a decline in urban¶ public transport service levels. Sprawling landconsuming¶ urban structures are making the journey¶ to work excessively long and costly, particularly¶ for some of the very poor. Surveys of commuters¶ in Mexico City have shown that 20 percent of workers¶ spend more than three hours traveling to and¶ from work each day, and that 10 percent spend¶ more than five hours.3 Poor people also suffer disproportionately¶ from deterioration of the environment,¶ safety, and security because they are¶ locationally and vocationally most exposed, and¶ less able to afford preventative or remedial action.¶ TRANSPORT PATTERNS OF THE¶ URBAN POOR¶ Poor people make fewer trips per capita than do¶ the nonpoor. The difference in total number of¶ trips per day per person is not usually extreme,¶ falling in the range of 20 to 30 percent, though¶ some earlier studies have suggested much greater¶ disparities.4 Consistent with the difference between¶ trip rates of the poor and the nonpoor, average¶ trip rates have also tended to increase over time¶ as income increases.5 In contrast, the composition¶ of the trip making of the poor and the nonpoor¶ differs very substantially. The nonpoor typically¶ make two or three times as many motorized trips¶ per capita as do poor people, even when total trip rates are fairly similar. In most poor countries, private¶ motorized vehicle trips are restricted to the¶ wealthiest 20 percent of the population, with the¶ motorcycle extending this down to those with average¶ incomes in middle-income countries.6 As¶ might be expected, poor people’s journey purposes¶ are more restricted, with journeys to work,¶ education, and shopping dominating.¶ The burden of transport on household budgets¶ often cannot be determined precisely. Incomes¶ may be difficult to establish, especially where there¶ is some payment in kind or where there are incentives¶ not to disclose the total income. Household¶ expenditure is therefore probably a better base¶ than is income, although it is believed that household¶ consumption surveys tend to understate¶ transport expenditures, while transport surveys¶ tend to overstate them.7 Subject to those caveats,¶ it has been estimated that transport accounts for¶ between 8 and 16 percent of household expenditures¶ in a range of developing countries in¶ Africa.8 Estimates for major cities in some other¶ countries also fall in this range, with 15 percent¶ for an industrialized country such as France.¶ In the context of poverty assessment, the proportion¶ of income spent on transport by different¶ income groups is of more interest. Typically there¶ are two steps in transport expenditures corresponding¶ to the progression from nonmotorized¶ to motorized public transport, and from public¶ transport to motorized private transport, respectively.¶ Where those steps take place in any country¶ depends on income level and distribution, as¶ well as on the quality, availability, and cost of public¶ transport. Studies in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso)¶ and Dakar show that the highest quintile spends¶ 20 times as much on transport as the lowest quintile,¶ but this only amounts to double the proportion¶ of income (Godard and Olvera 2000). In¶ virtually all countries, richer groups spend a higher¶ proportion of their incomes on transport than do¶ most of those with lower incomes.¶ However, the proportion of income spent on transport¶ varies greatly for the very poorest groups.¶ Some of the very poor may be forced to accept¶ precarious living conditions in order to be able to¶ access work. For example, a survey of pavement¶ dwellers in Madras, India, showed that 59 percent¶ walked to work at no cost.9 In other circumstances,¶ however, the burden of transport expenditure on¶ poor people may be very high. A study of lowincome¶ households in Temeke, Tanzania, 8 kilometers¶ from the center of Dar es Salaam estimated¶ that households spent between 10 and 30 percent¶ of their incomes on transport, with an average of¶ 25 percent (Howe and Bryceson 2000). The upper¶ limit was very income constrained, while many lowincome¶ earners in the formal sector claimed that¶ they could only afford public transport in the¶ period immediately after being paid. Later, after¶ their pay was exhausted, they walked.¶ Given the high cost of transport, the time taken¶ by the poor who are working to travel to work¶ varies greatly. The Madras pavement dwellers,¶ walking less than one-half an hour to work, are a¶ polar case of the tradeoff between transport cost¶ and residential quality. More generally, land-price¶ differentials reflect local environmental quality,¶ and are likely to do so more as the middle classes¶ grow and environmental expectations rise. Even¶ in the largest cities, there may be areas of barely¶ habitable or accessible land, such as those of the¶ “favellas” (squatter developments) in Brazilian¶ cities, which are relatively close to areas of potential¶ employment but which are unserved by formal¶ transport providers.¶ The other polar case in the tradeoff concerns¶ those who live remotely in order to inhabit affordable¶ space, and who thus incur both high travel¶ costs and long travel times. As a result of¶ apartheid policies, the average distance of the¶ black townships from the central business districts¶ (CBDs) of the seven largest South African¶ cities is 28 kilometers.10 Some poor people in¶ Latin American cities—such as Lima (Peru) and¶ Rio de Janeiro—are also driven out to inexpensive¶ dwelling space in remote locations, some 30¶ or 40 kilometers out of the employment center¶ (the average commuting time per day for the poorest group in Rio de Janeiro exceeds three¶ hours). Such peripheral locations typically involve¶ exclusion from a whole range of urban facilities,¶ a deprivation only partly overcome by family or¶ neighborhood solidarity.11¶ The transport patterns of poor people thus exhibit¶ a complex tradeoff among residential location,¶ travel distance, and travel mode, in an attempt¶ to minimize the social exclusion associated with¶ low earning potential. Differences in land prices¶ in developing countries generally reflect variations¶ in accessibility to the CBD or other centers¶ of employment. Since good transport contributes¶ to accessibility, it tends to drive up land rents and¶ drive out poorer residents, who can only afford¶ to live closer in as pavement dwellers or in slums¶ which are often inaccessible to motorized transport¶ and are very difficult to inhabit.¶ The role of transport in this complex concept of¶ exclusion may be characterized as follows. The¶ “income poor” make fewer trips, and more of¶ their trips are undertaken on foot. For most purposes¶ they are restricted to whatever services¶ (usually poor services) that can be accessed within¶ walking distance, making them “accessibility¶ poor.” The journey to work may be relatively long.¶ Even if it is not, it will use slow modes and may¶ be very time-consuming, so they are also “time¶ poor.” For poor people, and particularly for¶ women, children, and the elderly, trip making is¶ often deterred because of their vulnerability as¶ pedestrians, both to traffic accidents and to personal¶ violence, making them “safety poor.”¶ Finally, there is evidence that long walking distances¶ and times also creates tiredness and boredom¶ that reduces their productivity by adding¶ an “energy-poverty” dimension to their deprivation.¶ In assessing transport provisions for poor¶ people, it is therefore necessary to look at the¶ total package that defines “exclusion,” and not¶ simply to look at the proportion of income, or¶ even of time, spent on transport. Where public transport is not available, access to a private mode of mechanized transport may play a critical role in the extent of exclusion. In the United Kingdom, experiments with inexpensive¶ car loans for rural workers who can only¶ access jobs by private transport are improving¶ the lot of some relatively poor people. The equivalent¶ in poorer countries may be the development¶ of mechanisms for inexpensive finance of¶ private bicycles—together with public investment¶ in infrastructure for the safe movement of those¶ bicycles. This is discussed further in chapter 9. In addition to household characteristics, there are¶ also some specific personal characteristics that¶ accentuate deprivation. In most countries, over¶ 10 percent of the population has some form of¶ physical disability imposing serious disadvantage both in terms of mobility and safety (Merilainen¶ and Helaakoski 2001). For the physically impaired,¶ as well as for the elderly, public transport accessibility is often very poor and pedestrian facilities¶ are often nonexistent or are blocked by parked cars. Increasing attention is now being paid to¶ these groups in industrialized countries, and¶ guides to good design practice are available.12 While some aids to mobility are expensive, and raise issues of expenditure priorities in circumstances¶ where affordability of basic transport itself is an issue, many are not. Provision of pavement ramps to make road crossing easier for wheelchairs, tactile strips on station platforms to assist¶ the blind, large brightly colored signage to help¶ the partially sighted, and well-designed grab bars¶ and handles to assist the less mobile are all matters¶ of a more inclusive focus in design rather than¶ of expense.13 Good practice can be found in¶ developing as well as in industrialized countries.14¶ Gender-related disadvantage is also endemic.¶ Many activities typically undertaken by women¶ (childcare, household management, informal¶ sector employment, and so on) require them to¶ make more frequent and shorter trips than are¶ required of men. They make more trips at off-peak¶ hours and more trips that are off the main routes,¶ and engage in more complicated multileg trips,¶ all of which tend to make their movements relatively¶ expensive for public transport to provide, and hence more highly priced or more poorly supplied.¶ 15Women are very vulnerable to these cost¶ characteristics because they frequently have less¶ capacity to pay than do male household members,¶ who, in many cultures, also control any bicycles¶ or other vehicles available to the household.¶ Cultural factors may constrain women’s abilities¶ to use public transport or bicycles. In many countries¶ there is also a problem of the “social safety or¶ security” of public transport for women, especially¶ after dark.16 This may force them to depend on¶ more expensive alternatives. Peripheral location¶ may be particularly damaging to women’s employment¶ potential.17 To confirm this, a heavy agenda¶ of necessary gender-related research is required.¶ This includes a need for more activity-based, as¶ opposed to trip-based, research; better estimates¶ of the economic value of women’s time; and direct¶ evaluation of the impacts of some gender-related¶ projects.¶ Reforms aimed at improving economic efficiency may sometimes have the immediate effect of reducing employment of the poor or the relatively¶ poor. Constraints on the development or¶ behavior of the informal transport sector, discussed¶ in chapter 7, may take away the only¶ source of livelihood for some of the very poor.¶ Rail reform has also often been associated with¶ substantial severance of redundant staff, as has¶ occurred in Buenos Aires. In World Bank projects¶ this adverse side effect is mitigated by the imposition¶ of resettlement provisions based on a policy¶ of no detriment. But there is a wider issue. Not¶ all impacts are so directly apparent. Identification¶ of distributional effects of infrastructure works¶ and of reform policies, and the fuller involvement¶ of project-affected persons in decisions, is thus a¶ sine qua non for the avoidance of incidental¶ damage to the interests of poor people.¶ Some general conclusions may be derived immediately¶ from the analysis of the travel patterns of¶ poor people.¶ a. “Exclusion” is multidimensional, so low travel¶ costs may be achieved through the acceptance¶ of other heavy transport quantity, time,¶ or quality penalties, or through the acceptance¶ of very bad housing conditions.¶ b. The transport capability of a household is¶ critically dependent on its stock of private¶ vehicles (bicycles, motorbikes, cars, and so¶ on), as well as on its income and locational¶ characteristics.¶ c. The structure of provision of formal public¶ transport services tends to reflect and accentuate the distribution of poverty rather than¶ to compensate for it.¶ d. Some specific categories of people—¶ defined in terms of age, gender, or infirmity—¶ may suffer particular disadvantage in¶ transport terms.