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For African-Americans, public transit provides a cost-effective option to car ownership; more significantly, transit may be the only means of transportation available. A survey by the American Public Transit Association (APTA) showed that African-Americans represent approximately 31 percent of transit ridership. Results from this survey also show that minorities and the poor "use transit at a much higher rate than their representation in the general population." Thus, African-Americans are more dependent on transit for mobility than non-minorities and other minority groups. The "freedom of mobility" for most minorities living in urban areas, and African-Americans specifically, is restricted by the transit network in terms of accessibility of routes, hours of operation, and frequency of service. If the service is reduced or discontinued, this "freedom" is taken away.

For several years, African-Americans have been over-represented in the group of transit riders called the "transit captive." These are people that are dependent on public transit for transportation, such as minorities, low income residents, the elderly, and people below the driving age. This group accounts for more than half the annual ridership for most transit systems. The importance of African-Americans regarding transit ridership was epitomized by the Montgomery bus boycott in 1955, when African-Americans demanded an end to the discriminatory policies that required them to sit in the "back of the bus." The boycott had a major impact on that city's transit system: Ridership declined, and so did the system's revenues.

While African-Americans make up the largest share of public transit riders, they are usually absent from the decision-making process on issues, policies, and programs that affect their travel behavior and needs. On March 24, 1994, the Center for Urban Transportation Research at the University of South Florida convened the African-American Mobility Symposium (AAMS) in Tampa. The symposium established the first forum in recent times to discuss the special transportation problems and needs of African-Americans. The agenda included:

- presentations on how past and current policies continue to define travel behavior and transportation needs;
- analyses of travel patterns and behavioral characteristics;
- case studies of jitney services and their roles in public transportation;
- contracting opportunities and marketing services; and
- an open panel discussion on the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

The symposium was attended by over 60 participants from throughout the United States and the Caribbean. Representatives from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), state and local governments, and transit agencies, academia, and the private sector were among the attendees.

At the end of the symposium, a survey of participants' impressions of the symposium was conducted. Participants stated that the symposium either met or exceeded their expectations and gave the symposium an overall good rating. Participants also found the symposium to be "educational and informative."
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Welcome Address

Gary L. Brosch
Director
Center for Urban Transportation Research

Good morning. I am Gary Brosch, Director of the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR). Speaking for the Florida Department of Transportation and CUTR, I would like to welcome you to the Symposium on African-American Mobility Issues.

The Center for Urban Transportation Research, College of Engineering, at the University of South Florida, was created in 1988 by the Florida Legislature, the Florida Board of Regents, and the University of South Florida as part of the College of Engineering. CUTR's mission is to "bring together the benefits of education and research and to serve as an important resource for policymakers, transportation professionals, the education system, and the public by providing high quality, objective transportation expertise that translates directly into benefits for project sponsors."

As part of CUTR's efforts to integrate sound technical analysis and "real world" experience in solving transportation problems, we are pleased to have the opportunity to present this symposium. The objective of this event is to focus on mobility issues affecting the African-American community and other minority groups and the urban poor. It is also anticipated that this symposium will stimulate discussion on the special transportation problems and needs of African-Americans. For example, while African-Americans make up the largest share of public transit riders, they are usually absent from the decisionmaking process on issues, policies, and programs that affect their travel behavior and needs.

As a protected class—an ethnic or racial group specifically cited by law to require affirmative action—the special problems of African-Americans include three fundamental areas: lack of opportunity structures, lack of power, and low relative numbers. The lack of opportunity structures appears central. This problem speaks to the challenges within the African-American community that hinder large numbers of its members from adequately meeting their basic needs. Transportation—or mobility—is a key deficiency. This deficiency has been aggravated by the same issues—the decentralization of urban areas, modal bias, growth in travel demand, and so on—which led to the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

The ISTEA legislation presents several opportunities for inclusion of African-Americans in the transportation decision-making process. In economic terms, an estimated four million jobs will be created over the next six years in the transportation industry. Transit has traditionally served an enhanced function as a potential employer and a transportation service. Perhaps the most significant opportunity for African-
Americans is that of greater inclusion in planning and programming of transportation resources. ISTEA mandates more citizen participation in this area. This symposium will address that mandate by providing a mechanism to present those issues that have historically contributed to hinder African-American mobility.

This symposium is timely, given the wave of legislation, enactments, and technological developments that are influencing the transit industry today. It is anticipated that the symposium will foster additional research on minority travel behavior and needs. This symposium will provide information to community organizations and civic groups, thus enabling African-Americans to be involved in developing a transportation system that is equitable and efficient.
Mobility and Accessibility in Urban Cities
Case Study of an Oakland (California) Community

Leonie M. Hermantin, J.D., M.C.P.
Graduate Program in Urban and Environmental Systems

Sylvan C. Jolibois, Jr., Ph.D.
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
College of Engineering and Design
Florida International University

Introduction

Traditionally, the role of the transit/bus-rail systems has been to facilitate a locale’s access to employment. Additionally, transit systems generally ensure accessibility to goods and services which are crucial to the economic and social well-being of a community. Transportation and transit projections are based on assumptions about land-use patterns, household and business behavior, and transport system costs and services.

This model, however, becomes unreliable in communities where business behavior and, to a certain extent, land use patterns have become unpredictable. Business and essential services such as supermarkets and even health clinics are, for the most part, no longer centrally located in most poor communities. Residents have to travel longer distances for food and health care. The issue that will be addressed in this paper is whether transit services are sensitive to these shifts in travel patterns.

This paper focuses on the transportation needs of a small and low-income community. Its purpose is to demonstrate that transit services offered to that particular community, have not been responsive to its changing needs. The analysis is based on a study of the North-West Oakland neighborhood in Oakland, California. The study analyzes data collected from the U.S. Census Bureau and state and local agency reports, as well as the investigating team’s person-to-person interviews. The data used in this study were collected by a group of graduate students from the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California (UC) at Berkeley.

The preliminary results of the study suggest that the needs of this acutely transit-dependent community are poorly addressed by bus and rail networks. The research shows that available transit services do not reflect the travel needs of North-West Oakland’s transit-dependent residents. This mismatch of needs and services has affected the community’s accessibility to crucial destinations such as health clinics and supermarkets; i.e., entities which are not neighborhood-based.

Community Profile

North-West Oakland is in the northern section of the West Oakland Community...
"The preliminary results of the study suggest that the needs of this acutely transit-dependent community are poorly addressed by bus and rail networks."

Development District. It is bordered to the North by Interstate 580, to the east by Interstate 980, to the south by West Grand Avenue, and to the West by Mandela Parkway.

North-West Oakland is by all accounts a neighborhood that has fallen between the cracks. It has been overshadowed by three economically and/or politically powerful neighbors: Downtown Oakland to the south, West Oakland to the southwest (although considered a poor community as well, West Oakland enjoys far more political clout than its northern neighbor), and Emeryville/Berkeley to the north.

In addition to its political marginalization, North-West Oakland is a community lacking in essential services taken for granted by its counterparts. This neighborhood of 10,000 residents has no supermarket, post office, movie theater, or retail stores. It is not located within the vicinity of any major hospital or health facilities. To meet their daily nutritional needs, residents must either travel outside the area to shop for groceries or must rely on expensive and substandard goods available at the corner grocery/liquor stores.

Demographics

In 1990, approximately 10,000 people resided in North-West Oakland. Its population is predominantly African-American with a growing number of White and Latino enclaves (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N-W Clawson (prmrly.)</th>
<th>Oakland Total</th>
<th>Hoover 4014</th>
<th>McClymond (prmrly.)</th>
<th>West Clawson 4017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN-AMERICAN</td>
<td>163,335</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>120,849</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN INDIAN</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-43.6%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>54,931</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>108.5%</td>
<td>355.0%</td>
<td>437.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1427.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>30,766</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>103.9%</td>
<td>427.0%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATINOS</td>
<td>51,711</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Population</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (1980-1990)</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Characteristics
Approximately one-third of the area’s population is below the age of 18. North-West Oakland has a younger population than that of the City of Oakland. The senior population, those age 65 and older, make up 11 percent of the North-West Oakland area’s population.

Income
The North-West Oakland population has a median income of $12,858 dollars, 47.5 percent of the City of Oakland’s median, which was $27,095. This is by all standards a very poor community (Table 2).

Health Issues
Health issues in the neighborhood are typical health problems which plague the “inner-city.” There are high rates of teenage pregnancies, infant mortality, drug addiction, and communicable diseases, including AIDS and tuberculosis. Consequently, the issue of accessibility to health facilities is crucial. Local schools have attempted to mitigate this crisis by establishing school-based clinics. Although beneficial to the targeted student population, these clinics do not address the needs of the community at large.

“This neighborhood of 10,000 residents has no supermarket, post office, movie theater, or retail stores. It is not located within the vicinity of any major hospital or health facilities.”

| Table 2: North-West Oakland by Census Income Level and Education Attainment |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Characteristics             | Oakland Total   | Hoover 4014    | Clawson (prmly.) 4015 | McClummond (prmly.) 4016 | West Clawson 4017 |
| INCOME                      |                 |                 |                   |                   |                  |
| Total Households (HH)       | 144,521         | 3,475           | 1,527             | 712              | 605             | 631             |
| Median Household Income (1989) | $27,095         | $12,858         | $11,765           | $15,139          | $10,580         | $15,737         |
| Percent of Oakland Total    | 47.5%           | 43.4%           | 55.9%             | 39.0%            | 58.1%           |
| Percent of HH/w Public Asst.| 17.6%           | 40.6%           | 37.2%             | 37.2%            | 56.9%           | 35.2%           |
| Total Families              | 85,011          | 2,106           | 854               | 438              | 401             | 412             |
| Median Family Income (1989) | $31,755         | $16,655         | $17,018           | $16,580          | $13,710         | $19,375         |
| Percent of Oakland Total    | 52.4%           | 53.6%           | 52.2%             | 41.5%            | 61.0%           |
| Families Below Poverty Level| 14,174          | 711             | 306               | 150              | 185             | 70              |
| Percent Below Poverty Level | 16.7%           | 33.8%           | 35.8%             | 34.2%            | 46.1%           | 17.0%           |
| Total Female Head of Families | 26,400         | 1,006           | 430               | 203              | 245             | 204             |
| Total Below Poverty Level   | 9,160           | 493             | 211               | 103              | 144             | 35              |
| Percent Below Poverty Level | 34.7%           | 49.1%           | 50.7%             | 58.8%            | 17.2%           |
| EDUCATION ATTAINMENT        |                 |                 |                   |                   |                  |
| Persons 25 and over         | 242,097         | 5,610           | 2,420             | 1,085            | 977             | 1,128           |
| Percent High School Graduate| 74.4%           | 57.9%           | 58.8%             | 54.3%            | 57.3%           | 60.0%           |
| Percent Bachelor’s or Higher| 27.2%           | 8.6%            | 8.7%              | 7.5%             | 8.9%            | 9.3%            |

"A tighter fit must be found between the community's needs and the [transportation] services available."

Transit Issues

At the initial stages of the project, transportation or transit-related issues were not seen as a major problem for this community. We assumed a priori that the neighborhood’s transit needs were adequately met. In addition to having a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station within reasonable distance, residents, who are heavily transit dependent, rely primarily on Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) buses to travel. Four different bus lines go through the area:

- Line No. 72 (Hilltop Mall-Downtown Oakland) follows San Pablo Avenue;
- Line No. 15 (Montclair-El Cerrito BART) follows Martin Luther King, Jr., Way;
- Line No. 14 (35th Avenue/Brookdale Avenue-Downtown Oakland) follows Adeline Street; and
- Line No. 88 (North Berkeley BART-Jack London Waterfront) follows Market Street.

Most buses run along north-south corridors somewhat parallel to each other. Buses along those routes seem to follow the traditional patterns of linking the more affluent residential neighborhood to the central business districts (Downtown Oakland, Downtown Berkeley). There are no lines oriented in a perpendicular east-west pattern, which would allow residents to travel within the neighborhood.

For example, it is impossible for a transit-dependent resident to use any of the bus lines to go from 27th and Adeline to Broadway and 27th where the county’s health clinic is located. Residents relying on mass transit to shop for groceries must first travel south to downtown Oakland. Once in the downtown area, shoppers must transfer to another northbound bus. Finally, they must catch a second southbound bus which will take them to the closest major supermarket chain store.

Conclusion

This study has yielded a useful lesson to planners. In carrying out needs assessment type studies, planners must not assume that a community’s particular needs are being met simply because services that have traditionally satisfied those demands are offered. A tighter fit must be found between the community’s needs and the services available. Further investigations must be pursued to insure that the citizenry’s needs are not ignored by the providers of municipal services.
Running On Empty

Travel Patterns of Extremely Poor People in Los Angeles

Martine Micozzi
United States Department of Transportation

Introduction

The “Running on Empty” study was conducted by a team of University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) graduate students from the School of Urban Planning in 1992. The objective of the project was to document and analyze the transportation needs, travel patterns, and mobility constraints of public welfare recipients, the homeless, those living in shelters, and other poverty-stricken Los Angelenos.

This paper highlights some of the key findings of the study. The complete study was published by the Transportation Research Board in 1993, Record No. 1395.

In Los Angeles County, an area of 11 million residents and 500 square miles, accessibility to transportation is often the enabling or disabling factor in securing employment, food, shelter, and medical care. Many indigent residents spend a significant part of each day struggling to meet their needs for basic subsistence. Their survival often hinges on their ability to access highly-decentralized shelters, medical clinics, missions, and social service agencies.

Transportation for the impoverished is filled with many contradictions: Transportation services are available yet often unaffordable to the unemployed; public assistance is provided yet requires mobility to remain eligible for benefits; and social services are offered yet highly decentralized, thereby rendering them virtually inaccessible to those who lack mobility.

In a period of record unemployment, cutbacks, and downsizing, many Los Angelenos hampered by impaired mobility and living on scarce resources find themselves destitute and literally running on empty.

The lack of recent research exploring the relationship between transportation and poverty prompted the UCLA research team to conduct this study. The last major efforts on this topic followed the Watts riots of 1965, which served as a catalyst for a series of studies and demonstration projects exploring how the availability of transit services influences employment.

The McCone Commission which investigated the Watts riots asserted that the lack of available public transportation to employment centers was an underlying cause for the uprising. The commission’s findings
motivated the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to sponsor a 1966 demonstration project designed to test whether improving access to employment centers previously inaccessible to Watts residents would increase employment among this population.

One component of the demonstration project involved the establishment of a low-cost bus line which ultimately served 2,600 passengers per day. Sixty percent of the passengers used this bus service to commute to work, while 25 percent stated that the availability of this transit service enabled them to secure employment. The success of this project in South-Central Los Angeles demonstrated that employment increased as transportation barriers were removed.

With an eerie feeling of deja-vu, civil unrest erupted once again in South-Central Los Angeles in May of 1992, shortly before this study was completed. The findings of this study may provide decisionmakers with additional data on the travel patterns and mobility constraints of the poor in considering how to reduce welfare rolls and increase employment opportunities in Los Angeles.

**Methodology**

The methodology of this study involved the design and administration of a personal interview survey to indigent citizens of Los Angeles County in both English and Spanish. The survey consisted of questions related to each respondent’s general background, demographics, living arrangements, work history, monthly income and expenses, mobility and frequency of travel, and a trip diary. The UCLA research team had attempted to obtain an exclusive sample of recipients of General Relief (GR, a form of public assistance given as a last resort).

The research team was denied permission to conduct on-site interviews of GR recipients at the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services. Therefore, the UCLA research team conducted interviews at places poor people were apt to frequent such as homeless shelters, missions, and social service providers. Consequently, the sample consisted of respondents on various forms of public assistance, including: General Relief, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Supplemental Social Security, Disability, and Unemployment (Table 1). The survey sample consisted of 203 respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid</th>
<th>Percent Receiving Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFDC</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents may receive more than one type of public assistance, therefore the percentages exceed 100.

The interview locations were dispersed throughout five geographic regions of Los Angeles County: Downtown Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, West Los Angeles, the San Fernando Valley, and the South Bay. Locations included The Homeless Outreach Center, the Russ and Panama Residence Hotels, the Dolores Mission, the Eastmont and Santa Monica Community Centers, the Harbor Interfaith Shelter, and the Family Housing Corporation. Responses to the trip diary portion of the survey were geocoded, which allowed the research team to track actual travel patterns of the respondents.

**Demographics of Sample**

The typical survey respondent was a single, African-American male, 38 years of age, with a high school education and a monthly income of $344. The ethnic composition of our sample was as follows:
38 percent African-American; 30 percent Caucasian, not of Hispanic origin; 24 percent Hispanic; and 8 percent Other.

Over half of the sample was comprised of single men and women, with over one-quarter divorced. Only 11 percent of the respondents were married. Over three-quarters of the respondents speak English as their native language, and nearly one quarter were born in California. Approximately three-quarters of the sample have resided in Los Angeles for more than four years. These demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Basic Characteristics of Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>UCLA Survey (1992)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. Years in School</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td>23% California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59% Other State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% Non U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>38% African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>83% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>55% Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26% Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11% Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Language</td>
<td>77% English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Residing in L.A.</td>
<td>33% Resident &gt; 4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Relief in California

Public welfare programs are uniquely administered in each state. In California, each county determines the General Relief program eligibility requirements, policies, procedures, and amount of the monthly allotment. At the time of our study, Los Angeles County residents qualified for monthly General Relief payments in the amount of $291 if they had a monthly income of less than $291, owned less than $500 in personal property, and were United States citizens not supported by friends or family.

In order to remain eligible to receive General Relief benefits, recipients must work up to 17 days per month on county workfare projects such as trash collection or park maintenance and complete 24 job searches within a two-month period.

Although California State law requires each county to provide General Relief recipients with allocations for food, shelter, utilities, and transportation, Los Angeles County caseworkers provide bus tokens on an infrequent and arbitrary basis. This fact was supported by the survey results which indicated that nearly half of the respondents had never received a single bus token from the county. For General Relief recipients, the lack of consistent access to transportation is problematic because a certain degree of mobility is necessary in order to remain eligible for the benefits. Recipients are required to report to the county Department of Public Social Services in downtown Los Angeles to request transportation allocations. Due to the geographic expanse of the county, it is not uncommon to have to travel 20 or more miles in order to request bus tokens or transit passes. This scenario poses a paradox where one must have mobility in order to request mobility.

Respondents were queried as to the frequency of transit trips and the amount they spent for transit during the previous month (Figures 1 and 2). Nearly three-quarters of the respondents reported they took between three and 50 transit rides, and over a quarter spent between $26 to $60. This finding was surprising since monthly bus passes can be purchased for $42. Respondents indicated that they did not want to allocate such a large portion of their monthly income at the beginning of the month. The amount of additional income that might be earned throughout the month by recycling cans, perform-
Los Angeles County caseworkers provide bus tokens on an infrequent and arbitrary basis. This fact was supported by the survey results which indicated that nearly half of the respondents had never received a single bus token from the county.

Transportation is considered a need so critical to survival that they were willing to allocate a substantial portion of their meager budget toward fulfilling travel. Many respondents indicated they frequently forego food or shelter in order to have sufficient funds for transportation. The employment characteristics of the survey population indicated that nearly 40 percent had been laid-off. Over 80 percent of those unemployed stated that it was critically important for them to find a job, with over 80 percent claiming to have gone on at least one job interview that week.

Trip Diary
A trip diary was used to document travel time, distance, and travel patterns. Since many of the respondents spent the previous night in parks or other outdoor locations, the diary begins with the place where the respondent awoke on the morning the survey was administered.

On average, respondents made four trips per day. Nearly 60 percent of all trips were made on foot, and 26 percent were made on the bus (Figure 3). Less than 15 percent reported that they own a vehicle. Forty-three percent of the employed in our sample reported that they use the bus to travel to work, which underscores the importance of transportation allocations (Table 3). More than 25 percent of the respondents reported that they could not access jobs, and 25 percent could not access destinations such as social service agencies, child care centers, medical facilities, and storage lockers (Figure 4). Overall, 67 percent of the respondents indicated that there were places they were unable to access.
These highlights from the “Running on Empty” study provide a brief overview of the transportation needs and mobility constraints of the poor in Los Angeles. The findings from the complete study indicate that there are deficiencies between the transportation that is needed and the funding that is provided. The findings of the report suggest opportunities to reduce the welfare rolls, ameliorate living conditions, and increase economic and employment opportunities through improved access to transportation.

“Many respondents indicated they frequently forgo food or shelter in order to have sufficient funds for transportation.”
Gender, Race, and Employment Access in Buffalo, New York

Ibipo Johnston-Anumonwo, Ph.D.
State University of New York at Cortland

Introduction

One of the most consistent findings in the literature on commuting is that women have shorter commutes than men; although this finding is valid for the population in general, most studies obscure differences among women. In particular, racial differences among women is obscured. For example, a study based on 1980 data for New York City showed that previous generalization of shorter work trips for women does not apply to African-American women (McLafferty and Preston, 1991). There is currently an absence of similar studies focusing on differences among women in other urban settings, raising the question: Is New York City exceptional? One purpose of this study is to investigate the question of differences among women in another urban context. The study also contributes to the long-standing and continuing debate about whether or not black workers in U.S. metropolitan areas are more distant from centers of employment opportunities than white workers are. That debate is pertinent to the spatial mismatch hypothesis. Originally formulated by John Kain about 25 years ago (1968), the spatial mismatch hypothesis proposes that the suburbanization of jobs and the resiliency of racial residential segregation has led to a spatial mismatch whereby inner-city residents, primarily African-Americans, face difficulties in reaching the growing employment opportunities in suburban centers. Yet it is becoming increasingly clear that we can neither treat African-American workers—not women workers, for that matter—as homogeneous groups if we expect to come up with unambiguous conclusions about the validity of a spatial mismatch of workers and jobs.

Without going into any detail on the background literature, I basically identify two main omissions in previous research on accessibility to work: (1) Most analysts ignore the possible contribution of differences in workplace location to the racial difference in work-trip length, although most research usually takes differences in residential location into account; and (2) quite surprising is that, in the discourse on the spatial mismatch hypothesis, few scholars have considered the possibility that men and women may be affected differently. Indeed, few studies have examined the joint effects of gender, race,
and locational factors on commuting disparities. Many studies also do not control for some important factors that have been shown in the journey-to-work literature to affect work-trip length. For instance, travel time obviously varies by mode of travel; public transit users spend a longer time than commuters who use private vehicles. Apart from travel mode, longer travel times may also be due to traffic congestion, a reality in inner-city neighborhoods. Any accurate test of the possibility that blacks endure longer trips than whites, therefore, has to control for travel mode and residential location among other things such as income, occupation, child status, as well as area of residence and workplace location. Furthermore, while the spatial mismatch has been more documented for men in American cities, there is some question as to whether or not it exists for women. This is because, unlike blue-collar, manufacturing jobs whose decentralization into the suburbs is well known, the kinds of low-skill jobs that remain in central cities are largely service sector and clerical jobs, the incumbents of which tend to be women. In other words, if female-dominated jobs remain in the central city, then the spatial mismatch which we know exists for men might not exist for women. This study investigates this question in the Buffalo context. Lastly, an update that examines more recent data is necessary. A comparison of racial differences in the work trip over time is essential for analyzing the impact of differential locational access on employment disparities. This paper provides such an update by comparing data for 1980 and 1990 for Erie County in New York (with Buffalo as its central city).

Research Questions

Study questions that I investigate are:

(1) Do African-American women and men spend a longer time commuting than European-American counterparts?

(2) Do mobility constraints affect the work trips of African-American workers? If so, when auto use is held constant there should be no racial difference in work-trip lengths.

(3) Is location of jobs vis a vis residence responsible for differences in commuting lengths?

(4) What role do household demographic factors and socio-economic factors play in accounting for any observed racial differences? If differences in socio-economic background are responsible, when socio-economic factors are held constant there should be no racial difference; otherwise, spatial factors could be responsible.

(5) In particular, are differences in the geographical distribution of occupations responsible for racial differences in journey-to-work length? One expects that when these locational and socio-economic factors are held constant there would be no racial difference.

Data

I use census Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS, 5 percent samples) which contain fairly detailed information on individual workers' socio-economic characteristics and their locational and work-trip attributes. But there are at least two important weaknesses: (1) Only one-half of the 1980 samples were processed because of budget cutbacks, thus 1980 sample sizes are smaller; and (2) geographic information is not detailed. Only central city versus non central city locations are distinguished. Therefore, I generated four origin-destination commuting flows using central city versus non central city distinctions: (1) central city to central city, (2) central city to non central city ("reverse commutes"), (3) non central city to central city, and (4) non central city to non central city.

The results presented here focus on travel time (as a measure of the "cost" of commuting), which is the actual number of minutes spent from home to work as reported by the respondent. Travel time is estimated as the time the respondent arrived at the
workplace minus the time the respondent left home. Only black and white employed respondents 16 years old and older were selected. It is important to point out that studies like this one based on journey-to-work data miss out the situation of the unemployed.

Results

Differences between groups of workers are assessed using contingency tables, t-tests, and analysis of variance. The findings on racial differences are the focus of this paper.

Racial Differences

First of all, not surprisingly, although African-American workers in the 1990 sample are not as dependent on public transportation as they were in 1980, more black workers than white still use public transportation for their work trip. Also, more African-Americans reverse commute from central city Buffalo to suburban Buffalo. The data for female workers are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Overall, in 1980, black workers spent significantly longer times on their work trips than white workers, regardless of gender (Table 1). Black men in Erie County spent 22.5 minutes, while white men spent 20.9 minutes; black women spent 22.8 minutes, while white women spent 18.1 minutes. The racial gap in trip-length was more among women, especially in 1980.

By 1990, the racial difference in travel time to work is generally less. The most likely reason for the longer travel times of African-American workers is that black workers use more public transportation and other slower modes of travel than whites. Since more black workers use public transportation and since public transit users spend the longest time, I controlled for travel mode first. When travel mode is controlled, the racial difference reduces among auto users in 1980 and, in fact, the racial difference disappears by 1990. Indeed, by 1990 the trip length of black male auto users is actually 2 minutes shorter than the trip length of white men who use a car to work—18.2 minutes versus 20.2 minutes.
Thus, by 1990, it seems that the disproportionate use of slow public transit by African-Americans largely accounts for their longer commutes. However, in both 1980 and 1990, lack of access to private vehicles does not provide complete explanation for the racial gaps observed among certain segments of the Buffalo workforce.

In particular, when residential and workplace locations are controlled, some significant racial disparities in travel time are observed. These data are depicted in Table 2. Specifically, there are racial differences in travel time among female workers for work trips to non central city destinations, as graphed in Figure 3. African-American women spent more than 6 minutes longer than white counterparts in 1980. In 1990, black women spent 4 minutes longer than white women for reverse commutes and 3 minutes longer for commutes within the suburbs. Although it may appear small, the time cost is not trivial if one considers the two-way trip over a period of one year.

Black men with intra-city commutes spent about 3 minutes longer than white male counterparts in 1980; but in 1990, the trip times of black and white men are about the same for all the four origin-destination combinations. These disparities are graphed in Figures 4 and 5. It appears then that, unlike black men, black women bear a bigger cost for work trips to suburban destinations when

---

Table 1: Average Travel Time by Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race &amp; Sample Sizes (N)</th>
<th>Avg. Travel Time (mins.)</th>
<th>Group Comparisons t-test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Comparison by Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4876</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Group 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Group 2 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race &amp; Sample Sizes (N)</th>
<th>Avg. Travel Time (mins.)</th>
<th>Group Comparisons t-test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Comparison by Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9034</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>Group 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7966</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>Group 2 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1990

---

Figure 3: Females' Travel Time to Work Residual-to-Workplace Locations

This graph shows the travel time disparity between black and white females to work locations in Erie County, NY.
Table 2: Travel Time by Race and Gender
Controlling for Residential-to-Workplace Locations
(Auto Users Only) PUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race &amp; Sample Sizes</th>
<th>City to City</th>
<th>City to Non City</th>
<th>Non-City to City</th>
<th>Non-City to Non-City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black  495</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black  9034</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black  705</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  9034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black  7966</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race t-test values
Groups 1 & 2: significant at p .01
Groups 3 & 4: not significant
Groups 1 & 3: significant at p .01
Groups 2 & 4: significant at p .05

Gender t-test values
Groups 1 & 2: not significant
Groups 3 & 4: significant at p .01
Groups 1 & 3: significant at p .01
Groups 2 & 4: significant at p .01

1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race &amp; Sample Sizes</th>
<th>City to City</th>
<th>City to Non City</th>
<th>Non-City to City</th>
<th>Non-City to Non-City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black  371</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black  8434</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black  462</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  9034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black  7168</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White  1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race t-test values
Groups 1 & 2: not significant
Groups 3 & 4: not significant
Groups 1 & 3: not significant
Groups 2 & 4: not significant

Gender t-test values
Groups 1 & 2: not significant
Groups 3 & 4: significant at p .01
Groups 1 & 3: significant at p .01
Groups 2 & 4: significant at p .01

Figure 4: Intra-City Commuters' Travel Time to Work by Race and Gender

Figure 5: Reverse Commuters' Travel Time to Work by Race and Gender
"Since no racial commuting disparities were expected among workers in the same income group, the longer trips of low income black women is surprising."

In this context, the findings show that even when access to an automobile is not a hindrance the need to work outside the central city continues to place a disproportionate commuting burden on African-American female workers.

The role of non-locational variables that may lengthen work-trip times are also examined. Among these would be work-related variables such as income or household structure variables such as presence and ages of children.

Income and Child Status

The common expectations are that low wage earners will be less able to afford long commutes, and workers with high levels of domestic duties will try to meet time pressures by avoiding time-consuming commutes. Black and white workers usually differ in income and household composition, but African-American workers would be expected to have shorter commutes if their lower incomes disallow long commutes, or if they have non-employment obligations (such as child-care responsibilities) that place more demand on their time.

When income and child status are held constant, there are a few important racial differences among women. In both 1980 and 1990, low-income African-American women and African-American women with school-aged children spent slightly longer times on their work trips relative to white female counterparts (Figures 6 and 7). Despite low income and presence of children, black women commute longer than white women. Since no racial commuting disparities were expected among workers in the same income group, the longer trips of low income black women is surprising. The longer work trips of African-American mothers is also contrary to the common expectation that presence of children in the home reduces women’s work-trip length. (In both years, black men continued to spend about the same time as white men in most of the socio-demographic control groups.)

Over the decade then, in spite of the constraints, (1) low-income black women, (2) those with school-aged-children, or (3) those with suburban jobs in the sample still endured longer commutes than white counterparts. The emerging profile of black women who combine parenthood with wage earning endured long commutes to suburban destinations but earn only low incomes indicates that a spatial mismatch exists for this group of black women. These findings suggest continuing constraints in workplace accessibility among segments of employed African-American women.
The question, however, remains as to whether workers in particular occupations experience the constraint of employment suburbanization more than other workers. The next sets of results reported in the paper concentrate on racial disparities among different occupation groups.

**Occupational Categories**

One of the interesting changes in the commuting times of different groups of workers between 1980 and 1990 is that, although African-American and European-American female professionals and managers spent the same travel time traveling to work in 1980, by 1990 the travel time of African-American female professionals is shorter than for white counterparts (Figure 8). Secondly, in 1980 and especially in 1990, the work trips of African-American women in service occupations are longer than that of white counterparts. The much longer trip length of African-American service workers in 1990 actually constitutes the largest racial disparity of the four occupation groups (almost 5 minutes). These findings raise interesting questions about changes in employment distribution since service workers are the most disadvantaged over the period and across all groups. For example, compared to 1980, the average travel times of African-American service workers are longer in 1990; unlike white service workers who spent the shortest time getting to work in 1990, black women spent about the longest time. The shift to longer work trips for African-American service workers suggests a shift in employment accessibility for these groups of workers relative to white counterparts.

Although much reduced sample sizes limit the reliability of additional breakdowns, an analysis of central city versus suburban employment strongly suggests that the constrained work trips of African-American female workers is associated with suburban employment. The travel time of workers with central city employment is compared with those of workers with suburban employment (Figures 9 and 10). The comparison is...
"...noteworthy is the interaction effect between sex and race indicating that African-American women who reverse commute spend significantly longer times than either white women or African-American men."

Restricted to central city residents only because of the very small numbers of African-American women who reside in suburban Buffalo. At this level of controls, sample sizes are extremely small, particularly for reverse commuters in the 1980 sample; however, a few statistically significant results exist. Noteworthy is the disparity among service workers. In 1990, African-American service workers who live in the city and work in the suburbs spent almost 8 minutes longer than white counterparts. There is also a (smaller, though statistically significant) gap among service workers with central city work locations: African-American women spent 3 minutes more. But perhaps the most striking finding is the contrast between the flatness of the charts for central city work locations in 1980 and 1990 with the racially differentiated travel times for reverse commuters for both periods. These findings on the trip-length gap between black and white women suggest therefore that race remains a significant factor in workplace accessibility among women.

Gender Differences

The findings on gender differences are only summarized since they are relatively simple (illustrated in Figure 11 for 1980): In both years, white female workers spent significantly shorter times than male counterparts, while the work trips of African-American women were as long as those of African-American men. While the gender gap among white workers was decreased by 1990, shorter commutes for white women were persistent for both years despite separate controls on locational and socio-demographic variables (Table 3). The gender gap in travel time is not as unyielding among African-American workers. African-American women typically do not spend a shorter time than men (with the exception of commutes within Buffalo in 1980 when black women spent 3 minutes less than the men). In 1990, the travel time of African-American women who reverse commute to work destinations in suburban Buffalo is actually slightly longer than that of African-American male counterparts.
ANOVA
A multiple ANOVA summarizes these findings. Limiting the analysis to only central city residents, I assessed the separate and combined effects of gender, race, workplace location, and income on journey-to-work time. Income is a co-variate, and I present F-statistics for the other variables. Looking at the F-statistics in Table 4, both in 1980 and 1990, gender, race, and work location have significant main effects on the travel times of Buffalo city residents, but the effect of gender is less than that of race, while the lengthening effect of suburban work destination is the most pronounced. For both years, there is a significant interaction effect between gender, race, and workplace location. When desegregated by work location, the interaction effect between sex and race in 1980 represents the longer commutes of African-American men with central city employment, while African-American women with suburban employment spent a longer time than white women (who, unlike black women, also spent a shorter time than [white] male counterparts).

By 1990, central city work location had an equalizing effect on workers' travel time in just about all respects. Unlike central city employment for which travel time is the same across sex-race groups, race showed up as a significant differentiating factor for reverse commuters. Noteworthy is the interaction effect between sex and race indicating that African-American women who reverse commute spent significantly longer times than either white women or African-American men. Indeed, work trips to suburban destinations outside Buffalo city in 1990 still imposed longer travel times on African-American women relative to all comparable workers. In short, the spatial mismatch that existed for African-American women with suburban work destinations in 1980 continued to prevail in 1990.

"These findings for African-American working women confirm that it is important to conduct gender-specific analyses when examining the racial gap in commuting."

Table 4: Multiple ANOVA (F Ratios)
Controlling for Income, Gender, Race, and Workplace Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central City Residents Only (Auto Users)</th>
<th>Central City Work Location (Auto Users)</th>
<th>Suburban Work Location (Auto Users)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>20.1 **</td>
<td>4.4 *</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
<td>2.3 ns</td>
<td>3.3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>8.8*</td>
<td>5.8**</td>
<td>2.9+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>198**</td>
<td>195**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>0.1 ns</td>
<td>3.6*</td>
<td>2.9+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Workplace</td>
<td>2.1 ns</td>
<td>0.2 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Workplace</td>
<td>0.2 ns</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race x Workplace</td>
<td>7.1 **</td>
<td>6.6**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = 0.05  ** p = 0.01  + p = 0.10  "ns" = not significant
Note: Only respondents with income data were selected.
"Spending more time on the work trip could lead to lower motivation to seek employment; for those employed, it could mean more tardiness and absenteeism at work as well as poor job performance."

**Conclusion**

The data suggest that the longer times spent by African-American women may be expected to disappear if African-American women have access to automobiles. Indeed, by 1990, when they used private vehicles, African-American women generally spent about the same time as white women. Most black and white women, like male workers, have similar travel times. If, however, employment opportunities continue to expand in suburban locations and not in central city locations, African-American women (even those who use a car) face the penalty of longer commutes to suburban workplaces than do white female counterparts. While most African-American women work in central city locations (and, therefore, spend the same time as white counterparts), a sizeable fraction work in suburban locations (one-fifth), which typically entail long commutes. These African-American women are unlikely to enjoy the relative convenience of shorter commutes that characterize the journey-to-work behavior of white women.

**Discussion**

The analysis here leaves some questions unanswered. One possible explanation for the longer travel times of African-American workers in general is that blacks and whites live and work in different sub-areas in central city and suburban locations, but the spatial resolution in this analysis does not allow me to assess how this affects travel time to work. The neighborhoods in which black workers in the central city live may be more prone to traffic congestion or may lack direct access to high-speed freeways compared to the neighborhoods in which comparable whites live. Black workers, female and male, may be traveling through busy inner-city neighborhood streets for a longer stretch of their work trips than are white workers. Going through congested inner-city routes with numerous traffic light delays could easily account for black workers' longer travel times. The use of more detailed and/or spatially disaggregate data may show differential neighborhood proximity to highways.

Similarly, spatially disaggregate data on workplace destinations may reveal that whites and blacks have different work destinations either in central city or in suburban locations, which could be related to differences in their occupations. For instance, because the work trips of black women with suburban employment are much longer than those of white women with suburban employment, it is possible that black and white women are traveling to different work destinations in the suburbs. Evidence of differences between blacks and whites in workplace destinations within central city or within suburban areas would then raise the possibility of differential hiring of blacks and whites due to either differences in occupational qualifications or to employer discrimination. Examining detailed information on workers' occupations in conjunction with detailed workplace locations may reveal racial differences in the kinds of jobs that blacks and whites take and, therefore, differences in their work locations that lead to the differing travel times.

There may also be racial differences in proximity to bus routes, such that African-American workers spend a longer time between their homes and the bus stops than whites. Related to this is the possibility of a difference in the nature of the bus services in black versus white neighborhoods. If black workers have longer waiting times and/or more transfers to alternative bus routes, this would contribute to their longer travel times. Lastly, for bus riders, racial differences in working hours may translate to differences in the journey-to-work time if blacks are more likely to work later shifts than whites when bus service frequency is reduced.

It is possible that African-American workers use older and, therefore, slower cars that make their commutes inefficient, but there is no data on the age and mechanical
state of workers' automobiles. Nonetheless, the findings suggest that traveling to jobs, especially in suburban locations of the metropolitan area, places more commuting strains on African-American women than on white women and this amounts to a cost (tax) borne by black female workers. There are implications for African-American women in particular and society in general. Spending more time on the work trip could lead to lower motivation to seek employment; for those employed, it could mean more tardiness and absenteeism at work as well as poor job performance. For jobs where these qualities are significant for promotion, this might mean poorer promotion prospects and less economic gains for African-Americans.

Although this paper has concentrated more on female workers, despite the data limitations these findings for Buffalo show that suburban employment imposes a locational disadvantage on African-American inner-city women; therefore, it is inaccurate to understate the importance of geographical access to African-American female employment outcomes, and it would be premature to abandon the possible role of locational factors in analyzing the mismatch of workers and jobs.

These findings for African-American working women confirm that it is important to conduct gender-specific analyses when examining the racial gap in commuting. In Erie County in 1980 and 1990, it was among women that the racial gap is more resilient. The failure in some previous studies to examine the travel behavior of women and men separately may mask significant disparities in workers' accessibility to work. This could lead to misleading conclusions that black workers in general do not commute longer than white workers. Especially if the workplace location is included, analyses on racial differences in commuting can be more illuminating. In addition to sex-specific inquiries, these findings also underscore the necessity of race-specific analyses. I have found less gender difference in travel time among black workers. Most black women also travel as long as men. The generalization that women have shorter commutes than men does not necessarily hold for African-Americans; hence, the convenience of short commutes that is typical of white women cannot always be assumed for black women.

Lastly, the attention on sex/race-specific inquiries should not however remove attention from intra-group differences. Important differences among African-American women (as well as white women) make for more complexity in differential access to employment. Much of the evidence from this study, however, leads me to agree with the conclusions of McLafferty and Preston (1991) for New York that African-American women in Buffalo who spent a great deal of time commuting to low wage, low status jobs experience a very insidious form of spatial entrapment.

SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE


Jitneys in Dade County and New York City

Daniel K. Boyle
Transit Planning Program Manager
Center for Urban Transportation Research

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) undertook a study for Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, to examine jitney enforcement strategies in other major cities in the United States in which legal and illegal jitneys are in service. Jitneys are defined as passenger vans which seat 20 persons or fewer and operate by picking up and discharging passengers along major streets for an established fee. There is a lengthy history in Dade County of authorized jitney service in particular neighborhoods and travel corridors. Over the past several years, Metro-Dade Transit Agency (MDTA, the public transportation operator in Dade County) has suffered declining ridership on bus routes where competing illegal jitney service has arisen and made major inroads.

In the wake of Hurricane Andrew, Metropolitan Dade County received a federal grant to provide local transportation for residents in the hard-hit southern portion of the county. MDTA made arrangements to hire all qualified jitney operators to serve specific areas of southern Dade County under MDTA supervision. Along with improving transportation in the hurricane-ravaged areas, this action resulted in noticeable improvements in ridership on MDTA routes where jitneys had previously operated. At the end of the federal grant in August 1993, MDTA needed to devise a policy for dealing with the formerly illegal jitneys.

Specific issues considered in this study are how jitney service has developed in other cities, what (if any) enforcement actions have been tried in these cities, the success of these enforcement efforts, and the overall strategy (in place or under consideration) to deal with the jitneys. The results provide a different perspective for viewing Dade County’s jitney service and various enforcement actions which have been taken.

Jitneys in New York City

Unlike Dade County, New York City does not have a long history of legal jitneys. The first recent instance of unauthorized jitney operation was noted in southeast Queens during the 1980 transit strike, when individuals operating private vehicles began to provide local service and feeder transportation to the Long Island Rail Road station in Jamaica. These individuals continued in illegal operation as feeders to
There is a lengthy history in Dade County of authorized jitney service in particular neighborhoods and travel corridors.

the subway system after the strike was settled and regular bus service was restored. While private cars were used at first, 14-seat vans quickly emerged as the vehicle of choice for jitney service. The jitneys thrived along busy bus routes with peak frequencies of 12, 15, and even 20 buses per hour because of the high numbers of people congregated at bus stops along these routes.

Jitney fares originally matched the fares charged on New York City Transit Authority (NYCTA) buses. When bus fares have been increased, jitney fares have lagged behind for a period of time but have usually risen to match the new bus fares within one to two years.

Jitney operators generally did not observe any of the laws and regulations governing vehicles and drivers who carry passengers for hire. New York State had jurisdiction over vehicles of this size (larger than taxicabs but smaller than buses). Eventually, some of the larger jitney operators petitioned the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for authorization to operate back and forth between the subway and certain neighborhoods. NYSDOT evaluated requests on a case-by-case basis and granted legal authority to jitney operators who were able to show a demand for their services. The situation evolved to the point where legal and illegal jitneys operated with little constraint along the busiest NYCTA bus routes and along routes operated by surviving private bus companies (Green Bus and Jamaica Bus) in Southeast Queens.

Enforcement efforts were sporadic, given a lack of resources and low awareness of the problems caused by jitney operations. During most of the 1980s, the primary enforcement effort consisted of a single New York City Police Department officer in the local precinct in Jamaica. In 1989 and 1990, enforcement “sweeps” consisting of a concentrated one-day effort at a particular location became a standard practice. These sweeps resulted in a significant number of citations (interestingly, about 40 percent of the summonses issued are for unlicensed drivers), but their effectiveness was extremely limited. Estimates of the number of jitneys operating in New York City range from 2,400 to 5,000.

A policy report prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) staff in January 1992 indicates that jitney proliferation tended to occur in neighborhoods with high concentrations of Caribbean immigrants. Since jitneys are a commonplace form of transportation in Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Haiti, and other islands in the West Indies, immigrants from these places showed an immediate willingness to use jitneys. This cultural aspect regarding perceptions of public transportation service, particularly a familiarity with jitneys, appears to have been a necessary condition for the initial development of jitney service. The Dade County and New York City metropolitan areas have a much higher percentage of West Indian population. This might explain why jitneys have not emerged to any significant extent in urbanized areas other than New York and Dade County. It should be noted that after they are developed, jitney services attract a wider segment of the population in neighborhoods in which they operate.

Recent legislative developments may result in stricter jitney enforcement efforts. The New York State Senate and Assembly passed enabling legislation during its 1992 session and amended this legislation during the 1993 session. The enabling legislation allows New York City to adopt a local law regulating the jitneys. The city enacted local legislation in December 1993 that transferred responsibility for jitney regulation and enforcement from the state to New York City. The enabling legislation mandates several strong provisions which have been included in the New York City law.

In 1990, an interagency task force on jitneys was established to consider different
approaches to combat the problem. Two major enforcement efforts were undertaken in 1992, and are described in the next two sections. The first was along the Flatbush Avenue corridor in Brooklyn, and the second was first focused on Jamaica Center and later extended more widely in Southeast Queens.

**Jitney Enforcement Efforts: Brooklyn**

The Flatbush Avenue corridor in Brooklyn was selected as the first target for a controlled and concentrated enforcement effort. NYCTA used the strategy of targeting one specific location at a time in its graffiti eradication program in the 1980s. A major traffic corridor, Flatbush Avenue had experienced a large-scale influx of jitneys. A high proportion of these jitneys were illegal and, judging by the appearance of the vehicles, unsafe. The overall purpose of this experiment was to determine the ridership and revenue impacts, resource requirements, and cost effectiveness of concentrated enforcement.

Prior enforcement actions had been sporadic and limited, as noted in the previous section. The Flatbush Avenue experiment was designed to be a six-week effort (March 9 through April 19, 1992) for 16 hours a day on weekdays and 8.5 hours per day on weekends. The Transit Police Surface Crime Unit assigned approximately 20 officers and 3 supervisors on weekdays, with an additional 2 to 4 police officers assigned by a local precinct of the New York City Police Department. Towing resources and storage space were provided by the New York City Department of Transportation.

The conclusion drawn from the Flatbush Avenue experiment is that sustained jitney enforcement in conjunction with service improvements is a cost-effective action. The appropriate level and duration of effective enforcement has not been conclusively determined. Whatever the optimal level, it is clear that the combination of a sustained enforcement effort and bus service improvements can combat jitneys and reverse the trend of declining ridership and revenue on bus routes affected by jitney competition.

**Jitney Enforcement Efforts: Jamaica, Queens**

Jamaica is the hub of feeder bus routes extending throughout eastern and southeastern Queens. Southeast Queens is a two-fare zone since there are no bus to subway transfers in New York. A reduced fare initiative was undertaken in October 1992 in an attempt to reclaim lost market share on the Merrick Boulevard corridor buses. Instead of the one-way fare of $1.25, a round-trip fare of $1.50 was offered on the six bus routes. Riders would pay $1.50 on their way to Jamaica and receive a ticket for the return trip. Thus, a rider would experience a daily fare decrease from $2.50 to $1.50 for a bus-only trip or from $5.00 to $4.00 for a bus-and-subway trip. The Merrick Boulevard corridor routes were not operating at full capacity; thus, service adjustments required in conjunction with this initiative were minimal. Daily ridership increased on the six routes by 2,500, or 8 percent. Revenue had been expected to fall, but remained constant.

In December 1992, a concentrated enforcement effort began in Jamaica Center under the leadership of the New York City Police Department, with the assistance of the New York City Transit Police's Surface Crime Unit, NYSDOT Motor Carrier Investigators, the Taxi and Limousine Commission, Long Island Rail Road police, and NYCDOT. A second phase of the enforcement took place from mid-February through the end of June 1993 and was focused in the morning hours in the residential neighborhoods served by the major Merrick Boulevard corridor routes.

"A policy report...indicates that jitney proliferation tended to occur in neighborhoods with high concentrations of Caribbean immigrants...The Dade County and New York City metropolitan areas have a much higher percentage of West Indian population. This might explain why jitneys have not emerged to any significant extent in urbanized areas other than New York and Dade County."
The Jamaica experiment suggests that sustained enforcement combined with a reduced fare initiative can be a successful tool to increase bus ridership and revenue. The two private bus companies operating in Jamaica have experienced similar revenue increases during this enforcement. NYCTA’s Queens Surface Division also reports a significant reduction in accidents during periods of intensive jitney enforcement. As in Brooklyn, a key element is the combination of intensive enforcement with either a service improvement or a fare reduction.

Conclusions and Implications

Several conclusions may be drawn from New York’s recent experience with jitney enforcement. These conclusions have clear implications for future efforts.

1. Enforcement works, in conjunction with service improvements or fare initiatives. The Flatbush Avenue experiment in Brooklyn provides the best documentation that a concentrated, sustained enforcement effort, implemented in conjunction with bus service improvements, can be a cost-effective means of increasing transit ridership and revenue. While the increases experienced during the period of concentrated enforcement were not sustained, revenue on the B41 bus route one year after the enforcement and service changes showed an increase of 20 percent compared to pre-enforcement levels.

The combination of enforcement and fare initiative in Jamaica, Queens, was also successful in increasing transit ridership and revenue. Both the police and transit operating officials noted an improvement in safety during the enforcement period.

2. Integration of jitneys into the public transportation network is a desirable goal. All parties in New York agree that the jitneys are here to stay and that it makes sense to integrate them into the system. The major problem lies in defining what exactly is meant by integration and how this integration is to take place. The most promising method is to authorize the jitneys to serve areas or neighborhoods currently not served or undeserved by existing bus routes. In New York, these areas are not easily defined. In Dade County, the role of the jitneys in serving areas damaged by Hurricane Andrew strengthens the case for integrating them into the transit system. Dade County may have an easier time defining areas appropriate for jitney service due to continued growth in the county.

3. Even with integration, the need for enforcement will remain. Franchising legal jitneys to serve defined areas does not solve the problems caused by illegally operated jitneys. There will be a continued need for enforcement on the bus routes and on the new jitney routes. In addition, the legal jitneys must be monitored to ensure that their operation conforms to their franchise authority.

4. Cooperation between the union and the transit agency is necessary in resolving the jitney issues. The agency and the union are both affected by competition from the jitneys. Any solution must address the concerns of both parties in order to have a chance of success.

The large-scale emergence of jitneys has challenged the transit agencies in Dade County and New York City to examine policies and service issues more closely. Ultimately, the jitney operators may prove to be correct in their assertion that they have forced the public transportation agencies to be more responsive to customer needs. Enforcement efforts can play a significant and cost-effective role in addressing the safety problems associated with illegal (and sometimes with legal) jitney operation, while a means of cooperation between bus and jitney is sought.
Legitimizing Jitney Service

The Trinidad and Tobago Experience

Trevor A. Townsend, Ph.D.
General Manager
Public Transport Service Corporation
Trinidad and Tobago

Introduction

Trinidad and Tobago is a twin-island republic situated at the southern end of the Caribbean archipelago. Its population is approximately 1.2 million people. The larger island, Trinidad, has the majority of commercial and industrial activity and is the center of government. Tobago is relatively less developed, and its major business activity is tourism.

Trinidad is approximately 4,830 square kilometers, and its development has been tied to the nature of the plantation economy in the early part of its history when sugar was the major export and later to the petrochemical industry which developed during this century. The effect of the plantation economy is easily discerned in the fragmented development of the transportation linkages. Thus the capital city Port-of-Spain, which is located in the northwestern part of the island, first developed as a sugar port with the road and rail linkages along corridors to the plantation and mining areas. The second largest conurbation, San Fernando, is situated in the southwestern region of the country and services the petrochemical sector.

Trinidad has three mountain ranges running in an east-west direction in the northern, central, and southern areas of the country. The major river basin, the Caroni, runs southwest from the northern range and empties into the Gulf of Paria, which separates the island from the South American mainland. There are two major corridors of activity. The east-west corridor runs along the southern foothills of the northern range and is the most highly developed and densely populated. The major conurbation at its eastern end is the borough of Arima, the third largest town. The country’s biggest airport, Piarco International Airport, is situated just southeast of Arima. About 43 percent of the population lives within the east-west corridor. The north-south corridor runs through the Caroni plain to San Fernando and further south to Point Fortin, a borough which services the petrochemical industry. A third corridor also runs east from San Fernando to Rio Claro. In recent times, a major industrial estate has been developed in Couva hosting major hydrocarbon-based industries such as methanol, urea, and natural gas compression, and steel production.
Tobago is about 300 kilometers in area and its development has also been heavily influenced by its topography. The southwestern part of the island is on the lee side of the mountain range and contains both the port of Scarborough, the seat of governance, and the Crown Point International Airport. The windward side of the country is more rural and less densely populated.

The population densities in the two major urban corridors in Trinidad are in excess of 1,000 persons per square kilometer. In the rest of Trinidad, it is less than 500, and in Tobago it is as low as 150 persons per square kilometer.

One of the effects of the petroleum-based economy was a boom period in the mid to late 1970s, during which time the disposable income of citizens increased dramatically. This in turn led to a rapid increase in the vehicle population. The state embarked on a number of infrastructure projects, including highway widening and construction. However, the construction boom created shortages of materials and labor power, and the delays in start up of many projects resulted in the highway improvements lagging behind the demand and significant congestion of roads and highways leading to or in major urban areas.

The petrochemical industry has given the country one of the highest per capita incomes of the region. In 1993, the per capita G.D.P. was (U. S.) $3,099. However, with the decline in petroleum production and fall in oil prices, the country has been experiencing a recession since the mid 1980s with a decline in G.D.P. and employment levels. Unemployment now stands at 22 percent. Additionally, the country has had to service a large external debt which stood at (U. S.) $2 billion at the end of 1993.

Public Transport in Trinidad and Tobago

Public transport was introduced into the country in the form of horse-drawn hansom cab in 1862. However, the period of interest is from the pre-World War II years, when the public transport system consisted of the state-owned Trinidad Government Railways (TGR) and individually-owned buses and taxis. By the end of the war, the railway system was in need of new rolling stock and plants, the private bus operators were in financial difficulties, and, with the easy importation of automobiles, the taxi system began to flourish.

The then colonial government attempted to bring financial stability and order to the bus system by reducing the number of companies allowed to operate buses to six in 1952. The taxi system, which started initially at stands servicing hotels and nightclubs, expanded to route operations as the road system developed. This expansion was initially limited by the number of taxi licenses granted. Meanwhile, the TGR continued to lose both passengers and revenue to the faster and more flexible road modes.

The limits on taxi licenses did not hold, and by 1957 a Commission of Enquiry on Road Passenger Transport reported on the substantial increase in taxi operation and the consequent effects of this on bus patronage. Even at that time, the effect of the operations of these taxis on traffic circulation was a cause of concern.

In 1961, the state again reduced the number of concessionaires, this time to two, and provided, for the first time, a subsidy of up to 14 percent of annual operating costs. However, the decline in both the railway and the bus companies continued and, by 1968, the state had intervened and (1) closed the TGR; (2) nationalized the bus industry; and (3) formed the Public Transport Service Corporation (PTSC) as the sole bus operator.

The period 1968 to 1979 saw several attempts to improve the operations of the PTSC and a further growth of the route taxi industry. In 1979, the first paratransit vehicles called maxi-taxis were licensed. These vehicles were minibuses seating up to 12 passengers. The size restriction was increased to 25 passengers in 1982.

The population of Trinidad and Tobago is a relatively mobile one, making approxi-
mately 0.83 trips per day per capita. Of these, 60 percent are made by public transport. The current supply of public transportation in Trinidad and Tobago is made up of 20,000 sedan-type “route” taxis seating 4 to 5 passengers; 4,500 maxi-taxis seating up to 25 passengers; and 180 full-sized buses carrying up to 62 passengers. There are a further 200,000 privately-owned autos and trucks.

Both the route taxis and maxi-taxis operate a “transit” type system. Operators are free to select their routes (with some area-wide restrictions for maxi-taxis). The fares are set by loose associations of drivers based on consensus. The services are unscheduled as there are no official stops, although most routes have official stands at the end points of the routes. These are usually on-street in the most developed part of the town. Passengers either catch the vehicle at the stand or on route by hailing the first vehicle with space available.

The Maxi-Taxi Industry

The maxi-taxi operations were initially governed by Act No. 48 of 1979 and the associated Maxi-Taxi Act regulations of 1979. The regulatory controls on the maxi-taxi industry were in three main areas: (1) passenger capacity, (2) ownership and operation, and (3) route allocation.

The Act defined a maxi-taxi as “a public service motor vehicle with seating accommodation for not less than nine nor more than twelve passengers.” Thus, the government, for the first time since the PTS. Act of 1965, which created the PTSC, allowed the private ownership and operation of public service vehicles licensed for more than eight passengers without the authorization of the PTSC Initially 1,000 maxi-taxi permits were issued.

The regulations of 1979 prohibited the granting of a permit to own and operate more than one maxi-taxi to a successful applicant, except where the applicant was a society within the meaning of the Co-operative Societies Act. With the exception of co-operatives, no individual or group could own and operate more than one maxi-taxi. Thus, an individual could only own and operate one maxi-taxi. Additionally, in an attempt to forestall any “third party” investment, the application for a permit to own and operate required the applicant to swear that they were not employed and would work full-time as a maxi-taxi operator. The rationale for this regulation was to keep the industry within the “people’s sector” and out of the hands of “big business.” This was in keeping with the political philosophy of the government of the day.

The Act of 1979 also prohibited anyone who was not the owner/operator from working a maxi-taxi. The maxi-taxi industry was designed as a means of self-employment. Thus, the typical maxi-taxi operator in the initial stages was a retrenched or retired person who invested his severance package in the maxi-taxi and who worked it for 8 to 12 hours per day.

The country was divided into five route areas in Trinidad and one route area in Tobago. These areas or “bands,” as they are called (due to the color band painted to signify route of operation), were assigned by the licensing authority and an operator was only to operate in that area except on Saturdays, Sundays, and public holidays. However, within any broad route area, the operator could choose what micro-route he desired. The bands have points of overlap so that Port-of-Spain, the capital city, is served by three bands via routes 1, 2, and 3. Similarly, San Fernando is served by three routes; namely 3, 4, and 5. The entry of new vehicles or the transfer of old units from one route to another was controlled by various administrative arrangements. The regulations were amended in 1983 to allow for tours and chartered trips outside specifies route areas.

The Act was amended by Act No. 7 of 1982 to allow for a maximum capacity of 12 passengers. At that time, the government allowed the importation of 630 maxi-taxis seating between 13 to 25 passengers. Thus,
the total allocation at 31 December 1982 was 1,630 units.

During the next four years, the system was somewhat freed up and some 1,920 units had been imported. Additionally, the licensing authority approved the conversion of used panel vans to maxi-taxis. However, the number of applications exceeded 4,200. This shortfall created a thriving black market in "maxi-taxi rights" since persons traded their positions in the queue for approvals. The importation of fully assembled maxi-taxis was banned in 1987. Subsequently, the government temporarily froze the granting of new maxi-taxi operator permits and commissioned a review of the system.

The review found that the net profit of individual operators had been reduced due to a number of factors, the most salient of which were (1) the downturn in the general economy and the reduction in work and other travel; (2) an increase in the cost of new units and spare parts; (3) unavailability of some spare parts on the local market; (4) the quality and reliability of the locally-manufactured tires; and (5) the reliability of the engines and their suitability to the work involved—this was especially so for vehicles operating in some of the hilly rural areas and in Tobago. The review recommended (1) removal of the temporary freeze with guidelines for the maximum number of vehicles to be supplied on each route with an overall maximum of about 3,200 vehicles; (2) setting minimum standards for parts availability from suppliers of vehicles; (3) increasing the supply of maxi-taxi stands; (4) increasing policing of operator behavior; and (5) reviewing the specifications for the vehicles used to provide for more powerful engines, automatic transmissions, and power steering.

As a result of the review and also based on serious safety concerns about the use of used panel vans and costs concerns about a locally-assembled unit, the government lifted the freeze on licenses and also eventually allowed the importation of units in 1990.

As the number of large maxi-taxis in the system grew, the economics of the situation forced a circumvention of the various regulations. As the price of units increased, the individual owner/operator became a nonviable proposition. The operators needed the vehicle to be working for longer hours in order to recoup their investment. Several persons hired drivers to "operate" their vehicles. Others lent money to drivers who were the "official" owners. The 1979 regulations were also found to be deficient since they did not prescribe penalties for breaches. Matters came to a head when, in 1992, the Act of 1979 was defined as unconstitutional since it restricted the owner's rights to enjoyment of his property. The Act of 1979 had not been passed with the required majority vote in the House of Representatives.

This required a reenactment of the Act by Act No. 6 of 1992. Some of the more recent regulatory changes will be discussed in the following section.

Effects of the Maxi-Taxi System

As of 31 December 1993, there were 4,511 maxi-taxis registered. Of these, 3,435 were small and 1,076 were large vehicles. Given the rapid growth within the industry, it is clear that this mode has had a significant impact on the public transportation sector. However, the effect of this new mode has not been restricted to the transport sector. The non-transport effects of the industry have been the cause of much concern over the impact of the "maxi-taxi culture" on young people in particular.

The positive impacts of the system have been in (1) the supply of public transport, (2) the cost of public transport, and (3) the economic benefits of the industry.

The maxi-taxi industry has added over 68,000 public transport seats to the supply of transport. This has enabled better use of the limited road space than if the 4 to 5 passenger sedans were used. As a comparison, it would have taken over 15,000 sedan-type route taxis to supply the same capacity as
the maxi-taxis. It has been far more beneficial for the transport sector as a whole for the public transport to be supplied with the higher occupancy vehicles of maxi-taxis.

When compared with the bus system, the maxi-taxis offer more flexibility and, by their sheer numbers, a higher probability of getting to a place with a minimum waiting time. The owner/operators have a much stronger motivation to capture and keep customers than the employees of the state-owned bus company. This has lead to a quite high level of service from the maxi-taxi industry and a high degree of public acceptance.

As a result of the relatively high supply of maxi-taxis, the market forces have kept the fares of public transport at a relatively low level. Over the last few years, the public has experienced the effects of a number of fiscal measures which have increased the overall cost of living. These include three fuel price increases (totaling over 25 percent) and the flotation of the Trinidad and Tobago dollar which caused a devaluation of $0.35 relative to the U.S. dollar. The rate of inflation for 1993 was 11 percent. However, maxi-taxi and taxi fares have held fairly steady. The maxi-taxis receive no direct subsidy and, because of their lower operating cost per passenger mile, have fares which are generally lower than the sedan-type taxis.

The emergence of this mode has allowed the increase in capacity without the state having to expend scarce resources for acquisition of capital. The capital value of the private sector investment is in excess of Trinidad and Tobago, TT $400 million. With a purchase price of over (TT) $250,000 for a 25-seat vehicle, a maxi-taxi can be properly classified as a small business. The industry is estimated to employ either directly or indirectly at least 10,000 people. The growth of the mode has simultaneously encouraged the growth of a cadre of micro-entrepreneurs who own, operate, and maintain these vehicles. There are several international examples of how these owner-operated mini-buses can provide transportation at unit costs which are competitive with the unit costs of large bus organizations. This is especially so on the lower density routes. Indeed, on several rural routes, the bus company has subcontracted maxi-taxis to deliver services to school children at cost per seat, which is considerably lower than those by the larger buses.

There are four main concerns about the operations of the maxi-taxis as they affect the transportation system. These are (1) operator behavior, (2) vehicle safety, (3) congestion, and (4) use of road space for terminals.

There have been a number of serious maxi-taxi accidents which have been attributable to improper driver behavior. In particular, the drivers who are not owners are under tremendous pressure to make as many trips as possible in order to have enough for themselves after they purchase fuel and pay the owners (as much as $300 per day). They overtake dangerously, drive on shoulders to avoid traffic jams, stop indiscriminately, and create significant congestion as they attempt to woo passengers. One area of concern has been a loophole in the Act which governs maxi-taxis, which enables a holder of a taxi permit to drive a large maxi-taxi without a heavy vehicle license. This has been corrected in the legislation currently before the Parliament, which also legalizes the use of authorized drivers who are not necessarily owners.

Apart from driver behavior, there is clear evidence that maxi-taxi operators have been compromising vehicle safety in order to reduce their costs. This shortsighted behavior is due to the downward pressure on fares in spite of the increases in costs. Thus, vehicles are run without rear brakes, with rusted sub-structures, and smooth tires. Inspections by the PTSC of over 30 vehicles, which had all been licensed and ostensibly inspected for the current year, revealed that over 40 had safety-related defects which should have rendered them not road-worthy.
The rapid and unplanned growth of the mode has created road space problems in all urban areas. Traditionally, private taxi operators have operated out of on-street stands. With few exceptions, the maxi-taxi system has also evolved in this way. However, given the size and number of these vehicles, these on-street terminals have been areas of acute congestion, clutter, and confusion. The use of the limited road space for such activity is highly inefficient, and users of other modes as well as maxi-taxi users are severely affected.

Apart from the transportation effects, as the mode has become more popular especially with school children, there have been significant concerns about the effect of the “maxi-taxi culture” on young people in general. This culture is perceived to be based on loud “dub” music with violent and raunchy lyrics, drugs, and teenage sexual permissiveness. As a reaction to the public outcry over the noise levels in the vehicles, the current legislative changes outlaw the use of amplifiers, videos, televisions, compact disc players, and other electronic equipment except radios in maxi-taxis.

Several maxi-taxis stands are also controlled by “touts” who encourage and coerce patrons to use one vehicle over others and at times extort money from the operators. This illegal practice is encouraged by the haphazard arrangements in the on-street terminal activities.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

There are four main areas in which the state should intervene to ensure that the positive benefits from the maxi-taxi system are not eroded by the negative effects. The areas are (1) institutional arrangements, (2) operational policies, (3) market entry requirements, and (4) fees and charges.

The maxi-taxi is a multi-million dollar industry, but the institutional arrangements to support it are almost nonexistent. Under the Act, the Transport Commissioner is the administrator of the maxi-taxi system and is to be advised by an advisory panel comprising representatives of various bodies. However, over the years the advisory panels have met very infrequently and the system has not worked. Furthermore, the Transport Commissioner is essentially concerned about driver and vehicle licensing and the collection of the revenues from same from the state. Another concern is road safety. The office is certainly not equipped to manage the development of the industry.

There is a clear need for a Public Transport Authority (PTA) charged with the responsibility for the development and implementation of policies for the management and control of the public transport industry, including maxi-taxis. This institution would deal with all the aforementioned issues and must ensure that decisions on the industry are informed by proper analysis of market needs and plans in related sectors, such as land use and highway development.

In terms of operational policies, even in the absence of such an authority, it must be realized that a maxi-taxi is not, as its name suggests, a “large sedan taxi” but is, in fact, a small bus. Thus, the “taxi-type” operations which were tolerated with the sedans cannot be accepted with these vehicles. There needs to be a clear designation of official maxi-taxi stops as there are currently bus stops where commuters await their vehicles. Furthermore, the maxi-taxi terminal activity must take place off-street, and operators must pay fees for the development and upkeep of these facilities. The enforcement of these changes must be tied to the annual renewal of operator or driver permits. Successful implementation of these policies will significantly improve the service.

The suggested PTA would also be able to deal with market entry. It would do the research necessary to establish objective standards for numbers of units licensed, vehicle size, etc. In addition, it should set minimum quality standards for operators that deal with more than just the ability to handle the vehicle but also attempt to test for psychological suitability to the trade.
The design of the routing system should be reviewed. The tendency is for operators to concentrate their services in the most densely populated parts of their area. Thus, some areas within a route have excess suppliers while others may not have enough suppliers. By a micro-routing to more finely divide the areas, the new entrants can be targeted to these unserved markets. This could be done in conjunction with a market entrance fee that takes into account the existing supply, so that a fee for entrance into a congested route is higher than the fee for entrance into a relatively empty route.

**Summary**

The maxi-taxi has proven to be an important paratransit mode which has allowed the state to minimize its own expenditure in the public transport sector while ensuring an adequate economical and reliable service to non-automobile owners.

There is now a cadre of small business men and women who have invested in the industry and are earning a livelihood. The current imperative is for measured and timely intervention to ensure that the short-term optimization behavior of operators in response to current market pressures does not result in the degradation of the industry or the overall transportation sector.

Such intervention will require a dedicated agency of the state with the mandate to promote and foster appropriate development of the industry within the context of the national needs for access and mobility of the public transport-dependent population.
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Summary of Keynote Address

Arthur Kennedy
Florida Transportation Commission

Introduction

The Congressional Black Caucus participated in the Florida Policy Conference held in Miami the weekend of March 18, 1994. The conference consisted of 14 panels and was attended by more than 20 Congressional representatives. The panel on transportation was attended by Rodney Slater, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Gordon Linton, Administrator, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Thornton Williams, General Counsel, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), provided comments on how we [African-Americans] can get more involved in the political process and take advantage of some of the opportunities that exist within the transportation environment. Specifically with the state of Florida, the General Counsel talked about the need to get more minorities involved in contracting within the state DOT. Mr. Williams was specifically asked by State Representative Anthony C. Hill, Jacksonville, to be a part of that panel to spread the word and get as many people as possible to take a closer look at the State DOT in terms of the millions of dollars that are spent. Mr. Williams was also asked to try to get African-Americans involved in contracting opportunities. Representatives from transportation agencies will be meeting with him in the future to see what can be done.

Gordon Linton made comments about empowerment zones, which are expected to be a major part of his agenda. He specifically addressed the role of transportation in empowerment zones. Mr. Linton is also pressing the concept of livable communities.

Rodney Slater talked about the FHWA’s involvement in intermodalism and the joint FHWA-FTA planning process which has been signed by both administrators.

There are now two African-American administrators; as they travel throughout the United States, they are making sure that their views are heard. Training opportunities are needed for African-Americans.

Overall, the conference sessions were very successful. There are numerous opportunities available to empower ourselves and our communities.
Summary of Keynote Address

Mr. Kennedy brought greetings from the Florida Transportation Commission and Commissioner David Kerr from Hillsborough County. One of the problems in the African-American community, according to Mr. Kennedy, has been the practice of putting the "political eggs in one basket." If our candidate is not successful, we are left out of the process. There is a need to support different political parties. Multi-party participation led to Mr. Kennedy's appointment to the commission. He is on a committee that approved DOT projects for $8 million.

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) professors were concerned that they have been unable to get consultant work. With Mr. Kennedy's participation on the commission, they may well be able to. The commissioners hire the secretary of FDOT.

Thorton Williams, FDOT General Counsel, asked Mr. Kennedy to talk to young people, to encourage them to go into civil engineering versus electrical engineering. Mr. Kennedy asked Mr. Williams to explain the difference. Mr. Williams said the difference was being a generalist versus specialist. Mr. Kennedy shared with FAMU students an organizational chart of FDOT, noting that there are no African-Americans at the District Secretary level.

Mr. Kennedy gave an example of a young African-American woman who began work as a student in Congressman's Alcee Hastings' office. The young woman has now been hired by Thorton Williams' office and has had two promotions.

The story of charter government in Broward County was used by Mr. Kennedy to illustrate the need for participation and long-range planning. Seven commissioners were successful in instituting charter government in Broward. After their success, they resigned. In later years, the seven owned and sold the land to FDOT for Interstate-95. He encouraged the group to become qualified, to get involved in the process, and to see the future.
Transit Marketing for the Las Vegas Valley

Stanton D. Wilkerson
Transit Marketing Manager
Regional Transportation Commission of Clark County, Nevada

Background

In November 1990, the electorate of Clark County, Nevada, overwhelmingly expressed dissatisfaction with traffic congestion and the privately-operated transit system by approving a transportation funding measure, known as “Question 10.” The measure provided Clark County with $100 million in new transportation revenues. Of this, $20 million was earmarked from sales tax to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Clark County, Nevada, for mass transit.

In March 1992, a transit marketing manager was added to the RTC’s transit division staff to direct the development and implementation of the transit marketing plan.

Marketing the Citizens Area Transit (CAT)

The first priority for the RTC was to establish a new identity for the new transit system. A marketing and advertising firm was retained by the RTC to assist in the development of a name, logo, and color scheme for the new transit system.

The RTC faced a unique challenge in the start-up of the new public transit system. The citizens of Clark County had developed negative perceptions relative to public transit systems. Not only did the RTC have to overcome the traditional reluctance on the part of the public to utilize mass transit, the RTC faced a public that viewed mass transit as unreliable and severely limited in service area and hours of operation. In general, the public viewed mass transit as a socially unacceptable form of transportation. This was particularly true in the African-American community, especially within the youth/young adult markets and lower-to-middle income markets.

Therefore, in establishing the name Citizens Area Transit, the commission wanted to stress community-wide acceptance and ownership of the transit system and a color scheme that was attractive and quickly identifiable as something new and unlike anything that had previously been used in the Las Vegas Valley.

A multi-tiered, broad-based campaign was created that effectively addressed the negative perceptions that had existed relative to public transit. These campaigns,
while intentionally developed to be broad-based, effectively reached target markets such as the African-American ridership through the portrayal of African-Americans in the overall campaigns. The themes presented in radio and television were developed to reach both broad-based markets and specific ethnic markets. This was achieved through the modification to scripts, voice talent, or print copy translations. Special consideration was also given to how the ethnic groups were portrayed in the media campaign and the media buy.

Advertising Campaign

The first portion of the campaign, referred to as the “Pun Campaign,” humorously played on words and specific activities in daily life. The creative concepts included “CAT Tracks” (identified the routes), “CATTail” (built name identification picturing the back of a bus with an animated tail), “CAT Claus” (Christmas holiday shopping on a bus) and “CAT Woman” (a woman who uses the bus for daily activities—from workouts at the gym to shopping.) While these campaigns ran throughout the Las Vegas market, specific placement of these ads in minority publications and on ethnic radio stations helped in encouraging everyone to become transit users or at least friends of the public transit system.

The second phase of the campaign brought the public transit system closer to home. Ads, copy, and script were carefully developed to present CAT as being convenient, reliable, timely, acceptable, and operating both to and from needed locations throughout the community. “Live” talent was photographed and taped for corresponding print and electronic media ads. The models used portrayed a cross section of “everyday transit users”—older Americans, students, physically challenged individuals, business executives, and other commuters. Once again, the ads did not break out specific ethnic groups but incorporated them into daily operations of the transit system.

Placement in all media was orchestrated to reach both broad market segments and specific target groups. Advertising placement included television, radio, print, and outdoor mediums. Again, specific ethnic groups were not targeted with a different approach or message. The message and the media were modified to project CAT as an economical transportation alternative, and the publications and radio stations that were selected then created their own specific ethnic markets.

Taking the Product to the People

The last phase of the strategy involved community outreach. A community outreach program was developed to take the product to the people. A series of outreach presentations were scheduled that included taking a bus to community centers, grade schools, community events, and churches, and even included the formation of a softball team and a band.

Measure of Success

In the first year of operation of CAT, the RTC won three first-place Adwheel Awards from the American Public Transit Association (APTA) for marketing and advertising. Perhaps a better measure of success is the system’s ever-growing numbers of customers. Last year, which was CAT’s first year of operation, the system carried over 15 million customers and is currently averaging over 1.5 million customers each month.
ISTEA: Its Promises and Shortcomings
Panel Discussion

Moderator:
Gere Timberlake Anderson
Trans Ed., Inc.

Overview

The simple enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) is no guarantee that African-Americans or any group will benefit from this legislation. Congressman Norman Mineta advises inclusion, innovation, and a willingness to set and follow through on national priorities as a safeguard against complacency and the danger of repeating past mistakes:

"ISTEA is a model for decision-making in the America of the 1992 and the 21st century. [It] makes local officials and metropolitan planning organizations absolutely essential to what gets built in this country and the human benefits can be enormous."

The ISTEA legislation presents opportunities for the inclusion of African-Americans at all levels and in all facets of the transportation industry. In terms of employment, an estimated four million jobs are expected to be created over the next six years. The transit industry has a traditionally and important role as an employer in the African-American community. But perhaps the most significant challenge for African-Americans is that of greater inclusion in the decision-making process as mandated by ISTEA. The African-American Issues Symposium addressed that mandate by providing a forum for the discussion of this and other issues that are of direct interest to the African-American community.

This session was an open discussion aimed at providing insights and understanding of ISTEA. The discussion was intended to further ISTEA’s objective of “inclusion” by rekindling interest among local organizations in the transportation decision-making process. The session was lead by a facilitator, Gere Timberlake Anderson, and a panel of government officials and representatives.

After introductory remarks by panelists, attendees were given an opportunity to ask the panel questions about ISTEA from an African-American perspective regarding mobility, economic development, and so on. Time constraints did not allow the panel to address each question.

Summaries of the introductory remarks of the panelists are provided. The questions that were asked and responded to follow the summary remarks, followed by submitted questions that the panel did not have time to address.
Panelists’ Remarks

Sarah E. Ward
Principal Planner, Pinellas County (Florida) Planning Department/Metropolitan Planning Organization

Ms. Ward’s first introduction to ISTEA was pre-ISTEA. As a planner, she monitored the drafting of ISTEA, looking in particular at ISTEA’s impact on MPOs. (ISTEA mandates that areas over 200,000 be designated as transportation management areas, which is a new requirement.) Immediate impacts were seen at the staffing level. The legislation is also seen as an opportunity for the African-American community. Ms. Ward is responsible for contract monitoring and has experienced some difficulty in meeting disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) requirements in this area. Ms. Ward also is responsible for developing a public involvement plan. In the past, the MPO has not gauged the impact of existing public outreach plan nor has it come up with a proactive plan. Ms. Ward is looking for assistance in process and sees ISTEA as an opportunity for the MPO. The current plan is lacking in that it does not meet the particulars under ISTEA. ISTEA, in many ways, parallels the Growth Management Act. Ms. Ward sees opportunities for coordination of state and local agendas. The available literature indicates responsiveness to other acts, such as the 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (CAA). This provides additional opportunities for the MPO, such as the use of congestion mitigation-air quality (CMAQ) funds. These funds possibly could be used to purchase additional buses.

As a planner, Ms. Ward expressed some frustration with the legislation in that the Act was developed and promulgated before guidance was issued.

David Welch, Ph. D.
Member, St. Petersburg (Florida) City Council; Assistant Director of Finance and Facilities, St. Petersburg Vocational Institute

Dr. Welch stated that ISTEA was just another federal piece of legislation that does not address African-American concerns. If African-Americans do not sit on boards, ISTEA will not address needs of the community. For example, in Pinellas County, funds have been used not only to buy buses but also to build sidewalks in minority communities. Dr. Welch advised attendees to go back their communities and make sure that African-Americans sit on boards. He pointed out a number of ISTEA experts in the audience.

Paul Shuldiner, Ph.D.
Professor, Civil Engineering; Adjunct Professor, Regional Planning; University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Dr. Shuldiner stated that he thinks that ISTEA can be one of the most important pieces of legislation to provide opportunities to minority communities. The general approach is such that it is the most socially responsive piece of legislation in some time, even back to the 1916 Federal Highway Act. The Act is highly intermodal, which may be progressive or regressive. Whether funds will be used for highways or suburban commuters is still unresolved. The large research and development funding is regressive. Intelligent Vehicle-Highway System (IVHS), as discussed by Dr. Jolibois, is regressive. Greater emphasis on public transportation and concentrations of population can be progressive. As these factors relate to the CAAA, they can be progressive because it involves mode shifts. The congestion pricing elements are regressive. Physical destruction of neighborhoods was done by the 1956 Federal Highway Act. Most of the physical impacts
are past; access and employment are now critical. Things appear to be getting worse. Demography at the scale needed to plan is woefully lacking. The journey-to-work trends study in 1990 make no mention of ethnicity. Dr. Shuldiner finds little information of use in the Census in terms of minorities. Some of the literature discusses participation in employment activities as an amenity. There is a need for consistency with the Civil Rights Act of 1964; however, bringing those ideals and objectives into compliance may be the most challenging. Dr. Schuldiner does not think that there is anything in the area of public involvement to meet those objectives. Another piece of literature, "Innovations in Public Transportation Involvement," makes little reference to reaching minority communities. Dr. Shuldiner does not think methods used in transportation public involvement will be found in current experience.

Gloria J. Jeff
Associate Administrator for Policy,
U.S. Department of Transportation;
Federal Highway Administration

Ms. Jeff identified herself as an ISTEA expert because she was part of the team that worked on ISTEA as early as 1988. As an African-American, she stated that she struggled with comments of previous speakers. One problem was that the comments alluded to what ISTEA was not, rather than on what it could be. Another problem was that comments alluded to what ISTEA did not do, as opposed to what African-Americans can do for themselves.

ISTEA requires the transportation decisionmaking matrix to look different. Transportation professionals have the opportunity. We are required to reach out, not just discuss things in terms of "the VMT on this road is approximately level of service F and, in order to improve things, we will have to engage in these kind of widening projects for the next six months," etc. That is not the kind of language we are supposed to use. We are supposed to not talk about the green time on a cycle of a traffic signal when what grandma wants to say is, "Excuse me, honey, I can't get across the street in the amount of time left." We need to be able to hear and understand grandma.

Ms. Jeff admonished attendees as they complained about the lack of federal guidance. She stated that her state DOT did not wait. The new standard for what the management systems are going to be is being led by Michigan, which did not wait for the feds to offer guidance. Michigan said, "Let us see what we think needs to be accomplished," and pushed ahead. The African-American community can do the same. We are waiting on guidance. Don't wait. The African-American community needs to come forth. You know when the buses don't come. You have a vision of what transportation is supposed to be.

ISTEA is an opportunity. The fact that African-Americans don't speak the language of the transportation engineer or the urban planner is irrelevant because we know what our needs are. We have a vision about what we want our communities to look like. She pointed out that a lot of focus on transit is it being one mechanism by which we solve air quality problems. Ms. Jeff posed the question, "Who wants to guess whose neighborhood that terminal is going to be in and what related health problems become associated with that?" As we talk about transit as a solution, let's be very careful and recognize all its impacts. That's the thing that we as African-Americans can do.

The Transportation Research Board held a conference on moving urban America; TRB paid to have African-Americans from the communities that were impacted by transportation services attend. How did that happen? Because one African-American voice raised up and said, "You ought to have people at the conference who are people impacted by transportation." We have an amazing ability as African-Americans to communicate in a very assertive fashion. ISTEA is the opportunity to do so.
One of the significant things about ISTEA is that it talks about the impact of land use. Zoning is a locally-based activity. In Florida in particular, there are some opportunities with the growth management strategies. Decisions about where new development takes place as opposed to reinvestment in existing central cities is critical.

The other thing is take a hard look at environmental laws. Central cities are being adversely affected by environmental laws. The problem for cities is that it costs $10 million to clean up a central city site before construction starts. Another $20 million must be spent for construction. A businessperson builds in the suburbs because it only costs $3 million dollars to acquire property. The Sierra Club or the Environmental Defense Fund are not the sole environmentalist spokespersons. There are a large number of African-American-based groups involved in environmental justice. We need to put our intellect and our dollars behind those groups.

There are a host of opportunities for the African-American community. If you leave this conference with nothing else, remember that we—and no one else—control our destiny with respect to ISTEA.

Panel Questions

Attendees were given an opportunity to ask the panel to respond to the ISTEA questions that were gathered on index cards. Time constraints did not provide an opportunity to address each question, but the questions that were asked and responded to are presented below.

Question 1: How can I assure those transportation projects funded under ISTEA will benefit—not hurt—the African-American community? Specifically, how can I make sure there is really public participation?

Panel response: Each state is required to maintain an ongoing statewide planning process. This is a requirement for federal funding of transportation projects. This process is coordinated on the local level by regional MPOs. Local constituents should get involved in the process, not just a specific transportation project. Citizens should attend meetings of MPO technical groups, subcommittees, and citizen advisory committees.

Question 2: How will ISTEA impact African-American businesses?

Panel response: The federal government is seeking to reduce the size of most agencies, including DOT. As a result, DOT is increasing the amount of contracts with private consultants for services that are normally provided in-house. Thus, opportunities are increasing for African-American businesses in design, construction, and planning of transportation projects.

The flexible funding mechanism in ISTEA provides additional planning funds for contracting with African-American businesses in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000. Opportunities also exist for preservation of existing systems; i.e., maintenance of roads and capital facilities. ISTEA is also creating new opportunities for computer and marketing experts. African-American businesses need to become aggressive in responding to bid invitations and marketing their services.

Martin Guttenplan
Director, Florida Bicycle/Pedestrian Commuter Center; Florida Institute for Marketing Alternative Transportation (FIMAT), Florida State University

Mr. Guttenplan introduced himself and his organization. Florida Institute for Marketing Alternative Transportation works very closely with the Florida Department of Transportation. It is essentially FDOT's marketing arm for bicycle and pedestrian type activities. Mr. Guttenplan formerly worked for FDOT and had a lot of input into the enhancement project guidelines. Enhancement projects are just a small part of ISTEA.
Changes, however, are needed in the procurement process. Many requirements for bidding on contracts are too stringent; i.e., requirements for obtaining Disadvantage Business Enterprise status. One option for African-American businesses is to team with the large consultants. These companies are awarded several federal contracts and required by law to subcontract with minority firms.

Lastly, more minorities are needed in decisionmaking positions. Until this happens, contracts will continue to be awarded to private firms that are not representative of us.

Question 3: What are the benefits or possible disadvantages of ISTEA for African-Americans that are inner city residents, public transit dependents, and in low income groups?

Panel response: There are several publications that explain ISTEA and its possible affects—positive and negative—on local communities. Generally, ISTEA will provide resources to improve transportation systems. The DOT has also moved transportation in a different direction. The projects under the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways are complete. Instead of building roads, the DOT views its role as a manager of transportation systems. Under ISTEA preference for funding is given to projects that enhance communities, are compatible with regional mobility plans, and improve quality of life; thus, more transportation will be available. As ISTEA matures, all will benefit from this program. The downside, however, is that some state and local agencies will not get funding to keep abreast of ISTEA. Additionally, more capital facilities such as bus terminals will be located in low income areas because of property values.

Question 4: How will ISTEA provide money to allow for assessment and monitoring of equipment for "congestion pricing" with appropriate consideration for "equity issues"?

Panel response: The equity issues must be addressed first. Intellectually, congestion pricing makes sense and is a seductive idea. It makes it more costly to use transportation systems during the busiest times of the day. The idea is already being used in limited fashion for express bus service and transit service during peak times. Similarly, telephone calls cost more during busy times of the day. The equity question, however, has yet to be resolved. For instance, if travel is limited to certain hours of the day, then options for changing travel are restricted. ISTEA was modified to include some demonstration projects to address equity problems. Congestion pricing assumes that you can change your travel times. Typically, employees with confined travel options have less discretionary income and less flexibility in travel arrangements; i.e., access to a second car or an economical transit option.

Question 5: Where can I call to get questions answered about ISTEA?

Panel response: Cities over 50,000 have MPOs, councils of governments, and other planning agencies that disseminate information about ISTEA. In Florida, the FDOT Office of Planning can provide a list of planning agencies. There is also an opportunity to share this information through computer on-line services such as Prodigy and Internet.

The remaining questions about ISTEA are provided below.

☐ How will ISTEA provide job opportunities for minority and displaced workers?
☐ How will the African-American community receive its share of funding for transportation services?
☐ What is the mandate under ISTEA regarding community participation?
How is ISTEA different from former, similar legislation?
- How can we include African-American concerns in ISTEA II?
- How do properties find flexible funds, given 25-percent operating cuts?
  What specific types of projects qualify for flexible funds?
- How does ISTEA improve mobility for African-Americans?
- Although much has been written about ISTEA, many states, MPOs, and transit agencies do not understand all its implications. What do you believe is the best process to help these agencies understand what ISTEA can do for them?
- How can my community access ISTEA funds to make public transportation interface with a coordinated sidewalk system?
- What advantages will African-Americans receive from ISTEA (economically and financially)?
- What do you think will happen after 1997?
- What type of training is required for the jobs created under ISTEA?
- What new or expanded career opportunities is ISTEA likely to create?
- ISTEA suggests a policy of "inclusion." What measures are in place to ensure African-American participation at the community level?
- Is there anything in ISTEA legislation that speaks specifically to the needs of the African-American community?
- What is the proper avenue to travel for African-Americans to become more involved when funds are (not) allocated to the historical black communities?
- Isn't ISTEA just another way of dislocating African-Americans due to highway systems that cut through the heart of the inner city, without even allowing access ramps for those whose homes remain intact?
- Are African-Americans afraid of ISTEA in transportation?
- What modes of travel will be given preference under ISTEA?
- How will ISTEA improve the road system so we, as Floridians, can eliminate state and county toll roads?
- Is ISTEA a benefit or liability to the African-American community?
- What role does the MPO play in ISTEA?
- ISTEA allows everyone an opportunity to "come to the table"; however, once at the table, the state DOT orders how the money is spent. How can minority groups ensure that they have input at the state decisionmaking level?
- Will ISTEA make—and mean—a real presence in the African-American community?
- How will ISTEA improve air quality?
- How will ISTEA improve the ease that we as African-Americans can travel from Point A to Point B, such as roads that bypass small communities that have speed traps and unwarranted traffic signals?
- How can ISTEA increase ridership for transit authorities in the African-American community?
- How can black-owned firms, companies tap into the funds available through ISTEA?
- If ISTEA were never used, what would be better in its place in transportation for African-Americans?
- State and local MPOs administer ISTEA. What are their limitations?
- How can we get more dollars from superhighways to transit authorities (buses)?
- What percentage of the allotted funds will be distributed to the inner city problem areas?
- Why is ISTEA geared toward capital finance projects versus operating funds?
- Are there any provisions for an ISTEA planning/review process that allows for input from the African-American community?
- What amount has ISTEA increased funding for transportation?
- What discretionary power do states or cities have in using funds available through ISTEA?
"From the Back of the Bus to...Deep Space Nine?"

Reflections on African-Americans and ISTEA

Gloria J. Jeff
Associate Administrator for Policy
Federal Highway Administration

From the Back of the Bus to...Deep Space Nine? is an apt description of the promises of ISTEA. Transportation has been an active part of 20th century African-American history. An African-American created the first traffic signal. During the late 1930s and early 1940s, African-Americans benefitted from new employment opportunities in the North to build and supply tanks, trucks, jeeps, and other land transport vehicles during World War II.

During the 1950s in Detroit, Michigan—the “automobile capital of the world,” where I grew up—African-Americans gained large pieces of the “Michigan Dream” through employment in the auto plants. The Michigan dream was to own a home in the city, a summer cabin in Northern Michigan, and a boat. Employment in auto plants helped African-Americans to gain, temporarily, some economic and political clout. But there was a price for that clout: we African-Americans lost our neighborhoods to urban removal and highway construction.

The Civil Rights movement in the 1960s was closely tied to transportation. The Montgomery Bus Boycott, Freedom Riders, the march from Selma to Montgomery, the “Get the Vote Out” transport caravans—all of these efforts for equality were tied to transportation.

During the 1970s, opportunities were created for African-American entrepreneurs to get into the business of planning, designing, constructing, and maintaining the highway system through the minority business enterprise (MBE) program.

The 1980s saw increasing suburbanization of employment and wholesale departures of employees, wealth, and middle-class residents from central cities. This departure left many central cities populated by a majority of African-Americans.

ISTEA represents an establishment of a new order. This new order replaces the 36-year focus on the construction of the Interstate Defense Highway System. The focus for the future is how to better manage our transportation investments, improve the quality of services provided, and give our customers—those who use and those who benefit from the transport networks—an active involvement in the process of decision-making. This new process is quite different from the past practice of merely reacting to
the consequences of decisions made by others.

The greatest promises of ISTEA are (1) public involvement and (2) flexibility. Public involvement is actually more than a promise—it's a mandate. ISTEA requires public involvement from the beginning. ISTEA places a greater focus on overall benefits to the transportation network and a greater importance on the social and economic impacts of proposed land uses. ISTEA also promises the flexibility to apply dollars where dollars are needed—not where the pot of monies is available.

African-American transportation professionals can provide the keys for the future success of ISTEA. We can use ISTEA's emphasis on improved integration of transportation modes to ensure that ISTEA increases flexibility for African-American communities. To do this, we African-American transportation professionals must:

☐ Get involved. Learn how ISTEA affects our African-American communities. We professionals are responsible for listening, learning, and educating all of the public. Get involved in the process, not just a project.

☐ Provide a vision. Our vision can guide the plan that drives the projects that determines who gets the work.

☐ Strive to retain our neighborhoods/communities. Support transportation solutions that serve the people and needs of our areas.

☐ Seek opportunities for African-American entrepreneurs to participate in service delivery, both professional- and trade-related.

☐ Look beyond traditional actors. New metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are required to include transit and others. Citizens may be full voting members of the MPO policy.

☐ Educate our communities using African-American networks such as churches (ministerial alliances), the NAACP, local urban leagues, and neighborhood organizations.

☐ Consider the consequences of land use. Jobs have moved away from the central city, making automobiles and highways necessary to secure employment. We must scrutinize zoning decisions—including lot size, type of developments permissible, exceptions, etc.—to know and understand possible impacts.

☐ Promote environmental justice. We must be aware of issues of air quality and health issues in the transportation infrastructure.

The means for a better tomorrow is in how we act today to take advantage of the changes brought about by ISTEA. We have left the back of the bus. The promise of leadership into the 21st Century—and into the 24th Century of Deep Space Nine—is ours if we act now.
Evaluation Summary

Respondents' Comments

Attendees: 61

Number of Evaluations Received: 20

Response Rate: 33 percent

What respondents hoped to gain:

☐ [Information on] related transportation issues.
☐ Additional concepts of ISTEA as it relates to the African-American population.
☐ A chance to interact and exchange ideas with other professionals in the area.
☐ An understanding of the unique issues that affect African-American mobility or lack of mobility.
☐ Information on current research on African-American transportation needs, networking possibilities, and the chance to meet people.
☐ Information and a chance to talk with others.
☐ Valuable information for the new minority businessperson about the transportation industry.
☐ What can be done to solve the African-American mobility problem.
☐ Cultural aspects of the African-American community and how they relate to transportation.
☐ Insight to problems urban/suburban issues on mass transit.
☐ An opportunity to share and learn with African-American professionals about African-American transportation concerns.
☐ Ways to improve the flow of economics to black businesses.
☐ Insights on major factors related to expanding current inner city transportation and for development of services in neighboring urban communities.

☐ Further knowledge on how transportation decisions impact on African-Americans; information on ISTEA; job opportunities for African-Americans with non-engineering degrees within transportation, local or statewide.
☐ Insight into ads that show ISTEA to be fair.

Symposium achieved or exceeded expectations: 85 percent

Explanations:

☐ Networking and transit information was helpful.
☐ Achieved expectations, but could have used more time for networking.
☐ The presentations were quite interesting, and the contacts will prove very useful.
☐ I understand ISTEA a lot better.
☐ Not really knowing what to expect, I do feel a lot of valuable information was shared in this symposium.
☐ Short, but compact.
☐ The symposium seemed to emphasize interest in becoming more [of a part] of the decisionmaking process. However, I still have the question, "What is important, transit-wise, to this community?"
☐ Enhanced knowledge of African-American problems.
☐ Very little done in strategy planning to get dollars to black businesses.
☐ Quality of presenters was excellent.
The 1994 African-American Mobile Issues Symposium established a forum to continue the exchange of ideas, information, and for discussion of transportation planning, programming, and policy issues as they relate to the African-American population. Travel behavior and tripmaking is dynamic. Several factors affect decisions to travel, by what mode, and at what time of the day. Thus, the mobility issues in the African-American community will undoubtedly evolve during the next year.

To address the changing mobility demands of African-Americans, CUTR is developing a new format for convening the 1995 African-American Mobility Issues Symposium. The 1995 symposium will build on the knowledge shared during this year’s symposium and will integrate new issues, policies, and plans affecting this ethnic group. For example, follow-up discussions have alluded to efforts at the federal level to making amendments to ISTEA. Will these amendments incorporate the mobility needs of African-Americans? How should grass-roots and civic organizations coordinate their efforts best to be included in amending the Act? In addition, the lessons learned from the 1994 event are invaluable; so are the contacts and relationships that were established. Similar to this year’s symposium, a Steering Committee consisting of noted transportation officials will be established for the 1995 event. Federal, state, and local transportation agencies will be solicited for support and participation. Participation also will be requested from industry organizations, such as the Conference on Minority Transportation Officials, the National Forum of Black Public Administrators, and the American Public Transit Association.