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This research project was developed to explore and find an explanation of why Metro Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) has been eliminating bus lines and increasing the fares charged to its patrons. It will also explain why MARTA plans to eliminate more bus lines in the future. A case study analysis approach was used to analyze data gathered and survey research was administered to collect the public’s opinion and demographics. It examines the thought process put into the major changes the MARTA is continuously undergoing. Equity in public transportation covers a variety of inequalities in forms of fare inflation, bus stop and route elimination, and service taxes charged to both Fulton and Dekalb Counties. MARTA is funded by a 1 percent service tax that is paid by residents in Fulton and Dekalb Counties and the fares paid by its clientele. MARTA does
not receive any federal funding. The MARTA board has made the decision to eliminate several bus routes and stops, and increase fares simultaneously. The adverse effects impact many people, more specifically people of color. The conclusions drawn from the findings suggest that MARTA is a primary means of transportation for many of the residents not only in Fulton and Dekalb Counties, but Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett as well. MARTA is becoming less accessible, and the fare is becoming more and more unaffordable for its patrons.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research project was developed to explore and find an explanation of why Metro Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) has been eliminating bus lines and increasing the fares charged to its patrons. It will also explain why MARTA plans to eliminate more bus lines in the future. This transportation issue is significant, because it is key to large metropolitan areas as MARTA is the primary and secondary means of urban transportation for the people that live in Metropolitan Atlanta. Metropolitan areas may also be referred to as standard metropolitan statistical areas or metropolitan statistical areas.

The U.S. Census Bureau has defined a standard metropolitan statistical area as an urban area having a central city or pair of cities and suburban area with a population of more than 50,000 residents and an average population of at least 1,000 persons per square mile.\(^1\) Originally, in 1949 the standard designation was Standard Metropolitan Area; in 1959 it was changed to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. In 1983 the name was changed to Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and represented a city of at least 50,000 people, with a surrounding rural population. In 1990 Metropolitan Area was used to refer collectively to MSAs, Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs; more than a million people with strong internal economic and social links), and Consolidated

Metropolitan Statistical Areas (CMSAs). If two or more PMSAs are geographically linked, they are referred to as Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas.\(^2\)

These decisions also affect individuals who use MARTA’s “Park and Ride” system as a secondary means of transportation. The population that is impacted by these changes are people who live in metropolitan areas. If MARTA continues to cut lines and/or raise fares, people that live in the suburban areas (due to gentrification) and those already living in the suburbs may not have access to jobs, work, school, doctor’s appointments, etc. With massive growth, transportation issues have had major effects on the city of Atlanta and the surrounding communities. Although MARTA’s fares are currently increasing, they continue to cut bus lines. Many of MARTA’s customers are dissatisfied with the decisions to discontinue these services. Customers feel that they are being “let down” and inconvenienced by MARTA. Many complained existing conditions on MARTA are less than great. Samantha Boyce, a regular rider of the 24 Belvedere bus, noted riders already suffer through unreliable buses, rude drivers, and long wait times that result in riders being late to work and other obligations. Further cuts would only make problems worse, she said. We’re the ones who are suffering the most,” Boyce said. “We are at their mercy.”\(^3\)

According to the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, “Jyndiyah El-Amin knew that the big MARTA cuts now rolling out would mess with her Waffle House staff on Roswell Road. Out of seven employees on the 7 a.m. shift this weekend, one showed up on time. Waiting for the others to trickle in, the night staff had to keep working. Then came Monday, and the workweek. In the pre-dawn rain, Marlon Robinson stood waiting at the Lithonia park-and-ride lot for the commuter bus No. 216 to pick him up. When a reporter


asked what he would do now, it took a minute to register. “It’s not coming today?” he asked. The man next to him looked wide-eyed, said “It’s been cut?” and bolted to another bus standing nearby. As Robinson debated with a MARTA bus driver from another route about whether the signs posted in the No. 216 had confirmed the bus was cut, a third man walked up from the parking lot, heard their conversation, turned foot and ran back to his car.”

"I’m not going to make it home before the school bus," said Sharon Austin, who loves to greet her two youngest kids with a PB&J sandwich. She said she would normally take the No. 86 bus directly to and from her work as a home medical care assistant, but now she has to take three. "I’m usually at work by now. I’m really late," she said. "I didn’t think they were really going to do it." Austin said the morning seemed mixed up. "The buses this morning, they didn’t know where they were going. Everybody was behind schedule" by a few minutes, she said. "They weren’t familiar with the routes they were taking." 

"A spokesman for MARTA, Lyle Harris, said that the new train schedules were up over the weekend. As of dinnertime Monday, MARTA hadn’t been swamped with an unusually high number of calls, he said, but that could be because of shorter call-center hours, or because passengers were just getting their heads above water and would call later to figure it all out. "The day’s not out yet," Harris said. "We’re a little surprised. ... We’re bracing for folks who may be a little bit confused." At the same time, "we think we may have done a pretty good job communicating the changes." Considering what he called "dramatic" bus route changes, Harris added, "except a few snafus, we haven’t had any major problems with routes." 

MARTA officials say they have done their best to notify their 142,000 daily passengers that 440 miles of bus coverage are disappearing, as is train service before 6 a.m. on weekends. Although, MARTA is providing explanations for their actions, some of their customers do not feel these explanations are being justified. Many of MARTA’s

---


5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.
customers depend on its services as a primary, as well as the “Park and Ride” system, a secondary means of transportation. According to MARTA’s official website, www.itsmarta.com, effective October 3, 2011 fares increased and the maximum number of children allowed to ride MARTA, at no cost under 46” tall decreased.\(^8\)

This topic has a substantive impact on the study of Urban Politics, Public Policy, as well as Environmental Justice. The overall objective of this research is to discover how the Metro Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority is being administered, regulated, and funded, as well as its current impact on the community. This study explores the determinant factors in the board’s decisions to eliminate routes; what judgments went into MARTA officials’ consideration on how these decisions would affect the community as well as to what extent. This study attempts to develop some alternatives to current administration, regulations, and funding.

**INTRODUCTION**

Most major cities throughout the United States have a multimodal transport system, which is easily accessible and affordable. A multimodal transport system integrates different geographical scales from the global to the local. With the development of new modal and intermodal infrastructure, urban regions have a growing accessibility to the international market; several parameters of regional transportation are transformed, or at least significantly modified.\(^9\) According to Urban Transport: From Theory To Reality, the purpose of public transportation is to provide maximum benefit to


the community, there should be a clear understanding of its public purpose. Public transport is supported by taxpayers and ratepayers: to serve a social need by facilitating mobility for the disadvantaged (those without access to automobiles by virtue of low income or disability) and to serve an environmental need by providing an alternative to the automobile and thereby reducing traffic congestion, air pollution and energy consumption.¹⁰

The metropolitan area of Atlanta utilizes metro lines, buses, and shuttles, all under the operation of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA). In order to ride MARTA, the rider obtains a Breeze Card or Breeze Ticket.¹¹ Breeze tickets will no longer be sold at MARTA Ride Stores or Breeze Vending Machines. They will continue to be distribute through Group Sales Programs, K-12 Program and special events. Tickets will continue to be accepted as valid fare media on Bus and Rail (effective 10/2/2011).¹² The Breeze Ticket may be purchased for fifty cents and additional fare may be added at the time of purchase. The Breeze Card may be purchased for $1 and additional fares may be added me of purchase. It may store up to $100 in cash value.¹³ The fares for MARTA are single $2.50 fare covers one-way bus or train trips, including transfers.¹⁴


¹³Ibid.
MARTA buses and trains have a flexible schedule. The buses operate weekdays from approximately 5:00 AM to 1:30 AM. It operates until 12:30 AM on weekends and holidays. The bus schedules are relative to the neighborhoods in which they operate. The trains operate daily from 4:45 AM to 1:00 AM and weekends 6:00 AM to 1:00 AM (frequencies are weekdays: 6 a.m. to 7 p.m.: 15 minutes all lines, weekdays: 7 p.m. to 1 a.m.: 20 minutes all lines, weekends: 20 minutes all lines). MARTA does not discriminate when it comes to its clientele. It is MARTA’s duty to make sure public transportation is accessible to everyone. All of their ninety bus routes are equipped with wheelchair lifts or kneeling capabilities.

MARTA also operates mobility services for certain qualified riders. Priority seating is provided for senior citizens and persons with disabilities at the front of every bus. Each rail station is 100% accessible with special, wide fare gates for persons with disabilities to enter. There are escalators and elevators located between the rail, bus and street levels at each station. Each train has a special wheelchair space at one end of each rail car.

MARTA provides ADA Complementary Paratransit Service to people that are

---


17 Ibid.
eligible with disabilities who are unable to board, ride or disembark from an accessible vehicle in MARTA's regular bus or rail services. This service is referred to as MARTA Mobility. The modes of transportation are provided with special lift-equipped vans on a curb-to-curb, shared ride basis. This service may be acquired through a reservation and is available from 5:00 AM to 12:30 AM, seven days a week including holidays. The one-way fare is $3.80 per person. Eligible individuals requiring a Personal Care Attendant that has been authorized by a medical professional may have that attendant travel with the disabled patron free.

MARTA has helped to increase the economic growth and development of the Atlanta metropolitan area. MARTA has had a major influence on corporations’ decisions to locate and/or relocate in Atlanta. MARTA has helped Atlanta live up to its image as a world-class city steeped in a rich history of transportation. There was a study conducted by the American Public Transit Association (APTA). In 2001, APTA discovered that public transportation use in the Atlanta area saved 19.3 million gallons of gasoline, and kept more than 300 million pounds of pollutants out of the air. MARTA has one of the largest fleet of compressed natural gas buses in the nation, increasing

---


mobility while reducing pollution. MARTA's availability saves Atlanta residents approximately 25 million man-hours in traffic delays. Essentially, public transportation reduces gasoline usage by commuters, air pollutants, and traffic delays.\textsuperscript{22} At the same time, it offers its clientele easy accessibility, affordable rates, flexible schedules, and alternative means of transportation.\textsuperscript{23}

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

During the 1950s, the importance of public transportation was established in the city of Atlanta. Planners discovered that in order for the city of Atlanta to grow, it would need to build a rail system. The Metropolitan Atlanta Transit Study Commission report recommended a 66-mile, five-county rail system with feeder bus operation and park-and-ride facilities be taken into consideration during the planning processes and proposal writing. In 1965, the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act was passed by the state legislature. This act was established because of the rapid growth of the metropolitan areas of Atlanta, in hopes that it would help with the elimination of traffic conditions and congestion.

"Section 3. Legislative Findings and Declaration of Policy. The territory comprising the counties of Fulton, DeKalb, Cobb, Clayton, and Gwinnett, including the City of Atlanta, has developed, and continues to develop, phenomenally into a metropolitan area with a common interest in the cultural, social and economic well-being of the people therein and the development of the educational, commercial and industrial resources thereof. There exists in this metropolitan area serious traffic conditions and congestions and serious mass transportation problems, which impede, and will increasingly impede, the development of these common interests toward their fullest potential. Concerted

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{23} Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, \url{www.itsmarta.com}, (accessed February 21, 2011).
governmental action is needed to alleviate such traffic conditions and congestion, supply deficiencies in mass transportation, coordinate and balance the transportation facilities operating therein, and otherwise provide a sounder basis for the development of traffic patterns and control. The development of a rapid transit system through a joint instrumentality of the local governments within the metropolitan area is a reasonable approach to the aforesaid needs and problems. The cultural, social and economic well-being of the people in the metropolitan area and the development of the educational, commercial, and industrial resources thereof are matters of public interest and concern throughout the State. Accordingly, it is the public policy of this State, as a matter of public health, safety, convenience and welfare, to promote the establishment of such a joint instrumentality, encourage participation therein by the local governments involved, facilitate the accomplishment of its purposes and bring about solutions for the aforesaid needs and problems.24

The passing of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act granted approval for operation in four counties and the City of Atlanta. According to Chapter 3 Dismantling Transit Racism in Metro Atlanta of Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity, MARTA was hailed as the solution to the region’s growing traffic and pollution problems.25 Fares were initially 40 cents, but were reduced in the Fulton and Dekalb county service area by 62.5 percent to 15 cents. During 1972, MARTA serviced more than 65 million passengers due to the fare reduction. When compared to the previous year, this was a 21 percent increase. This was a 21 percent increase (11.5 million more) when compared to the previous year.26

---


During the 1970s, MARTA was awarded funding totaling over $800 million from the federal government. The funds were to be used in the planning, design, land acquisition and construction of a rapid rail system. MARTA opened its East Line train, which ran between Avondale and Georgia State Station on June 30, 1979. That same year, MARTA began the construction of the airport rapid rail station. The subway construction resulted in the closing of West Peachtree Street, between Baker and North Avenue, for two years. It was reopened in May 1980 to through traffic. In 1982, the Peachtree Center, West End, the Arts Center and Midtown stations began revenue service. Just two years later, there were five new stations opened: Lindbergh Center, Lenox, Brookhaven, Oakland City and Lakewood/F. McPherson.27

MARTA extended its South Line with the opening of its East Point Station in August 1986. Shortly after the opening of the East Point Station, the Chamblee Station began revenue service and served as the temporary end of the Northeast Line. The system was setup for trains to run on an eight-minute time intervals. This system also designated all southbound trains to run to the airport and all northbound trains to go to the end of the line at Chamblee. According to Bullard, Johnson, and Torres, Metropolitan Atlanta continued to experience record growth in the 1990s and grew from about 3 million residents in 1990 to almost 4 million in 2003.28 MARTA continued its expansion in the following years to open the Bankhead Station in December 1992, and the East Line.

---

27 Ibid.

services through Kensington to Indian Creek Station in June 1993.  

The leadership of MARTA by Kenneth Gregor came to an end when he retired from the Authority after being there for 21 years. He served as the General Manager for approximately 12 years. Richard J. Simonetta, previously General Manager of the Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA) in Columbus, Ohio, replaced Gregor. Simonetta was in charge of the heavy construction projects, which lead up to the 1996 Olympic Games. By the middle of 1996, MARTA had completed more than 20 major projects including the North Line, the new Perry Boulevard compressed natural gas (CNG) bus facility, new RideStores, ITS projects, escalator rehabilitation, mid-life overhaul of some rail cars, and automatic train announcements. MARTA’s North Line included the Buckhead, Medical Center, and Dunwoody Stations spanning all three funding jurisdictions (City of Atlanta, Fulton County, and DeKalb County). 

In the late 1990s, MARTA began its focus on MARTA’s link to community development as an alternative to highway congestion. MARTA announced a partnership with BellSouth to create the Lindbergh Transit Oriented Development (TOD), a live, work and play community built around a rail station in 1999. Today it’s called a “mixed-use development” or “new urbanism” but it used to be called “community.” It’s a place where people can live close to work and shopping and other services. It was the largest

---


30 Ibid.

multi-use development of its kind in the United States at the time. It received recognition from The *Atlanta Business Chronicle* as the “Best Mixed-Use (Real Estate) Deal of the Year.” This project consisted of BellSouth office towers, a multi-tenant office building, new parking decks and a Main Street retail promenade, apartments and condominiums.32

In 2000 MARTA provided service to its' 3.5 billionth customer, and opened two new rail stations, Sandy Springs and North Springs, on the North Line. That same year, leadership changed when the Board of Directors appointed Nathaniel P. Ford Sr. as MARTA’s fifth General Manager and CEO. Ford became MARTA’s first African American chief executive. By April 2001, the Laredo Garage Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Facility opened, providing more capacity for a bus fleet that was nearly half CNG powered. Shortly after its opening, an agreement was signed by MARTA and the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) to operate five fixed bus routes and paratransit service for Clayton County to start the C-TRAN system. MARTA’s security was forced to increase its impact soon after the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, granting MARTA Police its CALEA certification. MARTA joined the Atlanta Regional Commission and the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority in partnership to create the Transit Planning Board (TPB) in 2006.33

MARTA is presently led by two teams, The Executive Management Team and the Board of Directors. The Executive Management Team consists of Beverly A. Scott, Ph.D., *General Manager/Chief Executive Officer*, Dwight A. Ferrell, *Deputy General


33 Ibid.
Manager/Chief Operations Officer, and Ted Basta, Chief of Business Support Services.

The Executive Management Team is responsible for operations, maintenance, finance, and human resources. The Board of Directors is made up of 18 members, from City of Atlanta, Fulton, DeKalb, Gwinnett and Clayton counties.

The structure of my research project will be presented in the following order:

Chapter I Introduction: The Introduction will be a brief layout of my research, including the abstract and statement of the problem.

Chapter II Review of Literature: The Review of Literature will give its readers the background information needed to understand the history of MARTA.

Chapter III Methodology: The Methodology will list the research approach I took, including the research questions and the central research question.

Chapter IV Results: The Results will be the survey responses.

Chapter V Conclusion: The Conclusion will summarize the entire research project and reiterate my findings. It will also provide limitations to my research.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order for the research to be successful, the researcher would need to collect financial documents, scholarly journal articles, and previous research done on the subject matter. The required information needed to be successful in this research will be accessible through public libraries, and electronic documents (past research done on subject matter). The information gathered for this research will include existing analyses, studies, and quantitative and qualitative data. The information gathering technique will include the distribution and collection of surveys. The information gathering technique will not include personal observations. The following methods will be used to collect my
data: surveys and scholarly works on transportation equity in Atlanta, Georgia. The scholarly journal articles and previous research on the topic will both serve as a secondary source of data collection. I will be looking for past and present solutions used by MARTA and several other public transit systems here in the Atlanta Metropolitan area. There will be statistical procedures performed after the collection of data through the use of SPSS.

CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION

The central research question is “What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?” Hypothesis: By charging Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties service charges, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority would more likely maintain services and not increase fares. In addition to the central research question, other questions will be developed to help guide the study.

1. How should the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) be funded?
2. Who regulates the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)?
3. How should the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) be regulated after receiving funding?
4. What financial responsibilities does Fulton and DeKalb counties have for the funding of MARTA?
5. What is the problem with transportation equity and planning in Atlanta?
6. Which minority groups does it affect or impact?
7. How does MARTA compare with other public transportation sources such as Clayton County Public Transit (C-Tran), Cobb County Transit, and Gwinnett County Transit?

8. What is Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority financial structure for funding?

This research has been narrowed down to the central question of “What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?” An investigation into this question will help clarify the reasons why MARTA continues to raise fares, cut bus lines, and restrict services.

Research Question:

1. What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There is one theory of significance to this study: The Regime Theory. According to Gerry Stoker, regime theory holds substantial promise for understanding the variety of responses to urban change. Its emphasis on the interdependence of governmental and non-governmental forces in meeting economic and social challenges focuses attention upon the problem of cooperation and coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors.34 The Victoria Transport Policy Institute’s research on Evaluating Transportation Equity states that “equity” (also called justice and fairness) refers to the distribution of impacts (benefits and costs) and whether that distribution is considered

---

appropriate. Transport planning decisions have significant and diverse equity impact:

- The quality of transportation available affects opportunities and quality of life (for those who use public transportation).

- Public transport planning decisions affect the location and type of development that occurs in an area, and therefore accessibility, land values and developer profits.

- Public transport facilities, activities and services impose various indirect and external costs, such as congestion delay and accident risk imposed on other road users, infrastructure costs not funded through user fees, pollution, and undesirable land use impacts.

- Public transport expenditures represent a major share of most household, business and government expenditures. Price structures can significantly affect financial burdens.

- Public transport facilities require significant amounts of land that is generally exempt from rent and taxes, representing an additional but hidden subsidy of transport activity.

- Public transport planning decisions can stimulate employment and economic development, which have distributional impacts.  

DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE

Data collection, methods include survey research and secondary literature. According to Johnson and Reynolds, survey research is the gathering of information about the characteristics, behavior, or attitudes of a relatively large group of people, often referred


36 Ibid.
to as a “population”. The goal of survey research is to measure accurately people’s attitudes, beliefs, and behavior by asking them questions.\textsuperscript{37} Surveys of the same content will be distributed at the top five MARTA rail stations with bus bays. These stations will be identified by the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s Research Department. These survey questions are to be approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the collection of surveys will last until the last survey is completed. The past literature related to this research will be collected after reviewing various sources and selecting the scholarly writings relevant to my research topic. There is no special set of resources and/or support measures needed to facilitate the completion of this data collection. All the resources needed in conducting this research are made through survey research.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data collection methods will include survey research and secondary literature. These methods are being used, because there are specified questions and present a hypothesis to be tested. After collecting the responses from the survey research, I will then enter them into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The SPSS software will do the following:

- Quickly prepare data in just a single step with Automated Data Preparation
- View significance tests in the main results table
- Fast performance on procedures for Frequencies, Descriptives and Crosstabs
- Manage and analyze datasets

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid p. 176.
• Create customized, user-defined interfaces for existing procedures and user-defined procedures

• Multithreaded procedures that improve performance and scalability\textsuperscript{38}

Secondary literature will serve as a knowledge base for conducting the research project. It is essential in any research project to know a great deal about the subject matter. According to Johnson and Reynolds, “Good research involves reviewing what has been written. Among the many reasons for doing so are (1) to see what has and has not been investigated; (2) to develop general explanations for observed variations in a behavior or phenomenon; (3) to identify potential relationships between concepts and to identify researchable hypotheses; (4) to learn how others have defined and measure key concepts; (5) to identify data sources that other researchers have used; (6) to develop alternative research designs; and (7) to discover how a research project is related to the work of others.”\textsuperscript{39}

According to Victoria Transport Policy Institute, there are three major categories of transportation equity that are used to examine transportation planning and transportation decisions. They are listed and defined as follows:

1. Horizontal Equity

\textit{Horizontal equity} (also called \textit{fairness} and \textit{egalitarianism}) is concerned with the

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{38} IBM’s SPSS.com, “Why IBM SPSS Statistics?”,

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{39} Johnson, Janet Duttolph, and Reynolds, H.T., “Political Science Research Methods, 5\textsuperscript{th} Edition“, CQ Press, a division of Congressional Quarterly Inc. 2005, p. 132.
distribution of impacts between individuals and groups considered equal in ability and need. According to this definition, equal individuals and groups should receive equal shares of resources, bear equal costs, and in other ways be treated the same. It means that public policies should avoid favoring one individual or group over others, and that consumers should “get what they pay for and pay for what they get” from fees and taxes unless a subsidy is specifically justified.40

2. Vertical Equity With Regard to Income and Social Class

Vertical equity (also called social justice, environmental justice, and social inclusion) is concerned with the distribution of impacts between individuals and groups that differ in abilities and needs, in this case, by income or social class. By this definition, transport policies are equitable if they favor economically and socially disadvantaged groups, therefore compensating for overall inequities. Policies favoring disadvantaged groups are called progressive, while those that excessively burden disadvantaged people are called regressive. This definition is used to support affordable modes, discounts and special services for economically and socially disadvantaged groups, and efforts to insure that disadvantaged groups do not bear an excessive share of external costs (pollution, accident risk, financial costs, etc.).41

3. Vertical Equity With Regard to Mobility Need and Ability

---


This definition is concerned with the distribution of impacts between individuals and groups that differ in transportation ability and need, and therefore the degree to which the transportation system meets the needs of travelers with special constraints. This definition is used to support universal design (also called accessible and inclusive design), which means that transport facilities and services accommodate people with disabilities and other special needs (“Universal Design,” VTPI, 2005). According to Victoria Transport Policy Institute, these concepts can be measured through public facilities and services, user costs and benefits, service quality, economic impacts, and regulation and enforcement.

| Public Facilities and Services | • Amount and distribution of public funds for transport facilities and services.  
| • Parking requirements imposed on developers, businesses and residents.  
| • Government subsidies and tax exemptions for transportation industries.  
| • Use of tax-exempt public land for transportation facilities.  
| • Planning and design of transportation facilities.  
| • Degree of public involvement in transport planning.  

| User Costs and Benefits | • Overall level of mobility and accessibility (passenger-miles, trips, ability to reach activities).  
| • Vehicle ownership and operating expenses.  
| • Vehicle taxes and government fees, and fuel taxes.  
| • Road tolls and parking fees (including exemptions and discounts).  
| • Public transportation fares (including exemptions and discounts).  
| • Fitness (use of physically active modes, such as walking and cycling).  
| • Cost recovery and subsidies (portion of costs borne by a particular activity or group).  

| Service Quality | • Number of travel modes available in an area (walking, cycling,  

---

42 Ibid.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private automobile, vehicle rentals, public transportation, taxi, rail, air travel, delivery services, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roadway quality (traffic speeds, delay, safety, physical condition, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking facility supply, location, regulation, price and design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public transportation service quality (frequency, speed, reliability, safety, comfort, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land use accessibility (density, mix, connectivity, location of activities, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Universal design (accommodation of people with disabilities and other special needs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>External Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic congestion and risk an individual or vehicle class imposes on other road users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Air, noise and water pollution emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barrier effect (delay that roads and railroads cause to non-motorized travel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transport of hazardous material and disposal of hazardous waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aesthetic impacts of transportation facilities and traffic activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts on community livability.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Economic Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to education and employment, and therefore economic opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts on business activity, property values, and economic development in an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution of expenditures and employment (who gets contracts and jobs).48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regulation and Enforcement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulation of transport industries (public transportation, trucking, taxis, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic and parking regulation and enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulation of special risks (railroad crossings, airport security, hazardous material, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


47 Ibid.

48 Ibid.

49 Ibid.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
THE HISTORY OF TRANSPORTATION

Transportation is essential to our everyday lives. It can be defined as “An act, process, or instance of transporting or being transported, A banishment to a penal colony, or A means of conveyance or travel from one place to another and b: public conveyance of passengers or goods especially as a commercial enterprise.”⁵⁰ A more commonly used definition of transportation, would be any method used to travel from point “A” to point “B”. There are various modes of transportation. They can come in the form of cars, trucks, boats, planes, and motorcycles, just to name a few. Some may also include manually operated modes such as skates, scooters, and skateboards, which require more physical activity. The Atlanta area’s traffic congestion ranks the third-worst in the nation, according to the Texas Transportation Institute. That congestion is not only making life rotten for commuters. It is choking the region’s economy, according to experts.⁵¹ Transportation is a part of our daily lives and routines that can range from visiting with a friend and going to work, or from going to school and making a doctor’s appointment. It may also include going shopping and attending church.⁵²

There are two types of transportation that are important to this research,


transportation equity and transportation racism. Transportation equity is “where concerns extend to disparate outcomes in planning, maintenance, and infrastructure development. Transportation is a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, equal opportunity goals, and ensuring equal access to education, employment, and other public services.”53 These transportation equities can be broken down into three categories: procedural inequity, geographic inequity, and social inequity. Procedural inequity is the process by which transportation decisions may or may not be carried out in a uniform, fair, and consistent manner with involvement of diverse public stakeholders. Geographic inequity is the extent that transportation systems address outcomes that disproportionately favor one geographic area or spatial location over another. Social inequity is the distribution of transportation benefits to the wealthier and more educated segment of society, while transportation burdens fall disproportionately on people of color and individuals at the lower end of the socioeconomic spectrum.54 Transportation inequity and transportation racism have brought about various landmark court cases, such as Plessy v. Ferguson, Brown v. Board of Education, and Boynton v. Virginia.

The history of transportation racism in the United States dates back to 1892. An African American shoemaker, Homer Plessy was arrested for sitting in a white only car on the East Louisiana Railroad. His argument was that the Separate Car Act of Louisiana passed in 1890 was in violation of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. During his trial, he was found guilty in the Louisiana Supreme Court. Plessy felt that the decision made was unjust. He later appealed the decision to the U.S.


Supreme Court and lost a second time. The Separate Car Act of Louisiana enacted the separate “white” and “colored” seating in railroad cars. The U.S. Supreme Court’s case Plessy v. Ferguson, brought about the doctrine “separate but equal”. This doctrine also provided legal basis for racial segregation in places such as rest rooms, theaters, and public schools, throughout the United States.\(^{55}\) The concerns with transportation racism have been and will always be about civil rights, social justice, and fair treatment.\(^{56}\) In 1953, a group of African American’s in Baton Rouge, Louisiana by the name of United Defense League (UDL) staged the nation’s first successful bus boycott against transportation racism. The African American population made up a great percentage of the patrons that used the transit system and accounted for approximately two-third of its revenue. As a result of the boycott, the Baton Rouge bus company lost over $1600 a day.\(^{57}\)

The Baton Rouge bus boycott ignited a flame inside of Rosa Parks, a forty-three year old black seamstress. One evening in December 1955, she refused to give up her seat to a white man in defiance of local Jim Crow laws and was promptly arrested. This incident sparked the modern civil rights movement. This historical moment coined Mrs. Parks as the mother of the civil rights movement.\(^{58}\) Mrs. Parks’ incident initiated local black leaders to form the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA). The


\(^{58}\) Ibid.
Montgomery Improvement Association held their meetings at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, where they elected a young minister as their spokesperson, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Their goals were for the bus company to hire black bus drivers, more stops in black neighborhoods, and the elimination of the practice of forcing black riders to pay at the front of the bus but enter through the back. The MIA began a voluntary car pool in defiance of Jim Crow laws. The organization consisted of forty-eight dispatch and forty-two pick up stations creating a military type fashion. As a result of the car pools, Montgomery police began arresting drivers and handing out tickets for traffic violations for the overloading of cars, and arrested and harassed persons waiting at stops for loitering. In February 1956, the MIA filed a suit with the U.S. District Court. By June that same year, the MIA won their case in the U.S. Supreme Court. The Montgomery bus boycott showed how the black community united to fight for equal rights and introduced a non-violent approach to inequality.

A group of integrated individuals (consisting of seven blacks and six whites) known as the Freedom Riders left Washington, DC in route to New Orleans, Louisiana. They departed Washington, DC with the intent to challenge the Supreme Court ruling in Boynton v. Virginia case.

"U.S. Supreme Court Boynton v. Virginia, 364 U.S. 454 (1960): For refusing to leave the section reserved for white people in a restaurant in a bus terminal, petitioner, a Negro interstate bus passenger, was convicted in Virginia courts of violating a state statute making it a misdemeanor for any person "without authority of law" to remain upon the premises of another after having been forbidden to do so. On appeal, he contended that


61 "Congress of Racial Equality (CORE); The Freedom Rides: CORE Volunteers put their lives on the Road," http://www.core-online.org/history/freedom%20rides.htm
his conviction violated the Interstate Commerce Act and the Equal Protection, Due Process and Commerce Clauses of the Federal Constitution; but his conviction was sustained by the State Supreme Court. On petition for certiorari to this Court, he raised only the constitutional questions."\(^{62}\)

The Freedom Riders journey started out with minor hostility, but later ended with severe beatings and the bombing of one of their buses in Aniston, Alabama. Most of the riders were evacuated from Birmingham to New Orleans, but a former seminary student at the time who later became a U.S. congressman and leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC, pronounced “snick”), John Lewis remained in Birmingham.\(^{63}\) SNCC was founded on the campus of Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina. A few months later the organization began to coordinate sit-ins, support their leaders, and publicize their activities.\(^{64}\) From the organization of SNCC emerged leaders such as the former Washington, D.C. mayor Marion Barry, Congressman John Lewis and NAACP chairman Julian Bond.\(^{65}\) SNCC brought about the participation of such civil rights groups as Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), Nashville Christian Leadership Conference (NCLC), Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, National Association for the


\(^{65}\) Ibid.
Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), prompting the Kennedy Administration for support and protection.66

THE HISTORY OF GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (GRTA)

GRTA Mission Statement: It is the mission of GRTA/GDC to improve Georgia's mobility, air quality and land use practices.67

Guiding Principles:

• GRTA will operate as an open, accountable, efficient and effective public authority.

• GRTA will operate within a decision-making framework that values public participation.

• GRTA decisions shall be based upon fact-based analysis that provides the greatest public benefit for the resources invested.

• GRTA will work for the best interest of the region in cooperation with federal, state, regional and local partners.

• GRTA will advocate and implement a transportation system that is multi-modal, seamless, and accessible to all.68

Roles:

• GRTA will assist the Governor's office to develop transportation policies.

• GRTA will partner with state and regional agencies to prioritize transportation plans and programs and will cooperatively establish investment priorities and resource allocations to accomplish GRTA's mission.


68 Ibid.
• GRTA/GDC will measure effectiveness in improving air quality, mobility, accessibility and land use practices, and in reducing congestion.

• GRTA/GDC will encourage land use practices that promote efficient use of transportation investments.

• GRTA will cooperatively develop transit plans for areas within its jurisdiction.

• GRTA will coordinate transit services to provide seamless and accessible connections within the areas of its jurisdiction.

• GRTA will implement transit services through a combination of entities including local transit authorities, cities, counties and private operators.69

THE GRTA Board consists of fifteen members including a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Executive Director and members-at-large. Since Atlanta’s origin as a railroad terminal, our region’s growth has been spurred by its transportation system. There are many new transportation challenges being faced as we enter the 21st century: time, air quality, and the economy. Because of the hectic traffic, the time spent with our families is diminishing. The fumes from the automobiles produce poor air quality, which can be hazardous to our health. Atlanta’s future economic growth is jeopardized. GRTA is working to create a seamless, multi-modal regional transportation system that relieves congestion, and improves air quality. GRTA was a vital partner in the IT3 (Investing in Tomorrow’s Transportation Today) effort. They are joining forces with the Georgia Department of Transportation and others to select and implement transportation and transit projects. Their collaborative efforts will help create more reliable trip times and

69 Ibid.
increase access to employees and jobs throughout the state.\textsuperscript{70}

THE HISTORY OF GRTA XPRESS

Xpress is a public commuter transportation service, available Monday through Friday, daily for commuters. It's an alternative to driving their vehicles alone to work. The use of Xpress is intended to improve air quality and enhance the quality of life for all of metropolitan Atlanta. Xpress is in partnership with the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) and 12 metro Atlanta counties. It is Atlanta region's premier commuter transportation service, with luxury coaches carrying riders throughout the region.\textsuperscript{71} Xpress' partner agencies include Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), Cobb Community Transit (CCT), Gwinnett County Transit (GCT), and Cliff Shuttles to Emory.\textsuperscript{72}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Passes</th>
<th>Green Zone</th>
<th>Blue Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Way</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trip</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{70} Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, \url{http://www.grta.org/commuter_options/home.htm}, (accessed February 23, 2012).


THE HISTORY OF CLAYTON COUNTY TRANSIT

The C-Tran bus service system was first proposed by the Clayton County Board of Commissioners and approved by the voters of the county in July 2000. On February 14, 2001, the Board of Commissioners entered into a contract with the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) to run the bus service. In April 2001, the GRTA Board of Directors agreed to purchase the first 12 buses. C-Tran began its initial routes on October 1, 2001, and an additional route added in February 2003.

On October 13, 2009, the board voted 4-1 to terminate its contract with MARTA. The system had cost about $10 million per year to operate while collecting $2.5 million in farebox revenue. C-Tran ended its service on March 31, 2010. A previous bill was to go before the Legislature would have allocated some of MARTA’s sales tax revenue to Clayton County and would have restored C-TRAN service. On November 2, 2010 a non-binding referendum voted in favor of joining MARTA, 70-30. The Clayton County Board Members must vote and approve of the MARTA System in Clayton County,
before service is provided.\textsuperscript{75}

Your South Side Transportation is a privately owned transportation service that began servicing 503 and 504 routes on April 1, 2010. The company was granted an emergency permit to run so that people who normally rode the bus would have a bridge to get to work without feeling the stress of looking for transportation. One-way fare is $3.00. Your South Side Transportation currently operates two passenger vans.\textsuperscript{76}

On August 2, 2010 a new privately run service called Quick Transit started service on former C-Tran routes. A Clayton County investor, Tywanna Albro, started the new service that she called "Quick Transit". Albro bought eleven buses, acquired all the permits and licenses needed to operate.\textsuperscript{77} Quick Transit covers former C-Tran Routes 501, 502, 503 and 504. One-way fare is $3.50, with no free transfers to MARTA. Quick Transit stopped its operations due to low ridership and high gas prices on July 1, 2011.\textsuperscript{78}

THE HISTORY OF METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY (MARTA)

During the 1950s, the importance of public transportation was established in the city of Atlanta. Planners discovered that in order for the city of Atlanta to grow, it would need to build a rail system. The Metropolitan Atlanta Transit Study Commission report

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.
recommended a 66-mile, five-county rail system with feeder bus operation and park-and-ride facilities be taken into consideration during the planning processes and proposal writing. In 1965, the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act was passed by the state legislature. This act was established because of the rapid growth of the metropolitan areas of Atlanta, in hopes that it would help with the elimination of traffic conditions and congestion.

"Section 3. Legislative Findings and Declaration of Policy. The territory comprising the counties of Fulton, DeKalb, Cobb, Clayton, and Gwinnett, including the City of Atlanta, has developed, and continues to develop, phenomenally into a metropolitan area with a common interest in the cultural, social and economic well-being of the people therein and the development of the educational, commercial and industrial resources thereof. There exists in this metropolitan area serious traffic conditions and congestions and serious mass transportation problems which impede, and will increasingly impede, the development of these common interests toward their fullest potential. Concerted governmental action is needed to alleviate such traffic conditions and congestion, supply deficiencies in mass transportation, coordinate and balance the transportation facilities operating therein, and otherwise provide a sounder basis for the development of traffic patterns and control. The development of a rapid transit system through a joint instrumentality of the local governments within the metropolitan area is a reasonable approach to the aforesaid needs and problems. The cultural, social and economic well-being of the people in the metropolitan area and the development of the educational, commercial, and industrial resources thereof are matters of public interest and concern throughout the State. Accordingly, it is the public policy of this State, as a matter of public health, safety, convenience and welfare, to promote the establishment of such a joint instrumentality, encourage participation therein by the local governments involved, facilitate the accomplishment of its purposes and bring about solutions for the aforesaid needs and problems." 79

The Passing of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act granted approval for operation in four counties and the City of Atlanta. According to Chapter 3

Dismantling Transit Racism in Metro Atlanta of “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity,” MARTA was hailed as the solution to the region’s growing traffic and pollution problems.\textsuperscript{80} Fares were initially 40 cents, but were reduced in the Fulton and DeKalb county service area by 62.5 percent to 15 cents. During 1972, MARTA serviced more than 65 million passengers due to the fare reduction. When compared to the previous year, this was a 21 percent increase.\textsuperscript{81}

During the 1970s, MARTA was awarded funding totaling over $800 million from the federal government. The funds were to be used in the planning, design, land acquisition and construction of a rapid rail system. MARTA opened its East Line train, which ran between Avondale and Georgia State Station on June 30, 1979. That same year, MARTA began the construction of the airport rapid rail station. The subway construction resulted in the closing of West Peachtree Street, between Baker and North Avenue, for two years. It was reopened in May 1980 to through traffic. In 1982, the Peachtree Center, West End, the Arts Center and Midtown stations began revenue service. Just two years later, there were five new stations opened: Lindbergh Center, Lenox, Brookhaven, Oakland City and Lakewood/F. McPherson.\textsuperscript{82}

MARTA extended its South Line with the opening of its East Point Station in August 1986. Shortly after the opening of the East Point Station, the Chamblee Station began revenue service and served as the temporary end of the Northeast Line. The

\textsuperscript{80} Bullard R., Johnson, G., & Torres, A., “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism & New Routes To Equity, Chapter 3: Dismantling Transit Racism in Metro Atlanta” p. 52.

\textsuperscript{81} Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, \texttt{www.itsmarta.com}, (accessed February 23, 2011).

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid.
system was setup for trains to run on eight-minute time intervals. This system also
designated all southbound trains to run to the airport and all northbound trains to go to the
end of the line at Chamblee. According to Bullard, Johnson, and Torres, Metropolitan
Atlanta continued to experience record growth in the 1990s and grew from about 3
million residents in 1990 to almost 4 million in 2003.83 MARTA continued its expansion
in the following years to open the Bankhead Station in December 1992, and the East Line
services through Kensington to Indian Creek Station in June 1993.84

The leadership of MARTA by Kenneth Gregor ended, when he retired from the
authority after being there for 21 years. He served as the General Manager for
approximately 12 years. Richard J. Simonetta, previously General Manager of the
Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA) in Columbus, Ohio, replaced Gregor. Simonetta
was in charge of the heavy construction projects, which lead up to the 1996 Olympic
Games. By the middle of 1996, MARTA had completed more than 20 major projects
including the North Line, the new Perry Boulevard compressed natural gas (CNG) bus
facility, new RideStores, ITS projects, escalator rehabilitation, mid-life overhaul of some
rail cars, and automatic train announcements. MARTA’s North Line included the
Buckhead, Medical Center, and Dunwoody Stations spanning all three funding
jurisdictions (City of Atlanta, Fulton County, and DeKalb County).85

83 Bullard R., Johnson, G., & Torres, A., “Highway Robbery, Transportation Racism & New
Routes To Equity, Chapter 3: Dismantling Transit Racism in Metro Atlanta” p. 51.

84 Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, www.itsmarta.com, (accessed February 23,
2011).

85 Ibid.
In the late 1990s, MARTA began its focus on MARTA’s link to community development as an alternative to highway congestion. MARTA announced a partnership with BellSouth to create the Lindbergh Transit Oriented Development (TOD), a live, work and play community built around a rail station in 1999. Today it’s called a “mixed-use development” or “new urbanism” but it used to be called “community.” It is a place where people can live close to work and shopping and other services.\textsuperscript{86} It was the largest multi-use development of its kind in the United States at the time. It received recognition from The \textit{Atlanta Business Chronicle} as the “Best Mixed-Use (Real Estate) Deal of the Year.” This project consisted of BellSouth office towers, a multi-tenant office building, new parking decks and a Main Street retail promenade, apartments and condominiums.\textsuperscript{87}

In 2000 MARTA provided service to its 3.5 billionth customer, and opened two new rail stations, Sandy Springs and North Springs, on the North Line. That same year, leadership changed when the Board of Directors appointed Nathaniel P. Ford Sr. as MARTA’s fifth General Manager and CEO. Ford became MARTA’s first African American chief executive. By April 2001, the Laredo Garage Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Facility opened, providing more capacity for a bus fleet that was nearly half CNG powered. Shortly after its opening, an agreement was signed by MARTA and the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) to operate five fixed bus routes and


\textsuperscript{87} Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, \url{www.itsmarta.com}, (accessed February 23, 2011)
paratransit service for Clayton County to start the C-TRAN system. MARTA’s security was forced to increase its impact soon after the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, granting MARTA Police its CALEA certification. MARTA joined the Atlanta Regional Commission and the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority in partnership to create the Transit Planning Board (TPB) in 2006.88

Two teams, The Executive Management Team and the Board of Directors, presently lead MARTA. The Executive Management Team consists of Beverly A. Scott, Ph.D., General Manager/Chief Executive Officer, Dwight A. Ferrell, Deputy General Manager/Chief Operations Officer, and Ted Basta, Chief of Business Support Services. The Executive Management Team is responsible for operations, maintenance, finance, and human resources. The Board of Directors is made up of 12 members from the City of Atlanta, Fulton County, DeKalb County, the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Out of the 12 members, two of them represent the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, and the Georgia Department of Transportation.89

MARTA’S COUNTERPARTS

Another public transit system that is comparable to MARTA is the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). BART made its humble beginnings in 1946. An Army-Navy review Board felt that in order to eliminate intolerable congestion on the Bay Bridge, an underwater tube with high speed electric trains should be developed connecting San

88 Ibid.

Francisco and Oakland. In response to the Army-Navy review boards proposal, the State Legislature created the 26-member San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Commission. The commission was comprised of representatives from each of the nine counties, which touch the Bay. It was developed to study the Bay Area's long-range transportation needs in the context of environmental problems. Based on the problems they found, they were to develop resolutions. The Commission stated that, "If the Bay Area is to be preserved as a fine place to live and work, a regional rapid transit system is essential to prevent total dependence on automobiles and freeways." After a plan was devised, it needed to be placed on the November 1962 general election ballot for a 60 percent approval of the district's voters. It was passed with a 61.2 percent approval of a $792 million bond issue to finance a 71.5 mile high-speed transit system, consisting of 33 stations serving 17 communities in the three counties. This plan also included rebuilding 3.5 miles of the San Francisco Municipal Railway, linking muni streetcar lines directly with BART and Market Street stations, and four new Muni stations would be built. The total cost of the system was projected at $996 million. The largest single public works project ever undertaken in the U.S. by the local citizenry, during that time. BART opened its doors for business on Monday, September 11, 1972 between Fremont and MacArthur.


91 Ibid.
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Boston's first concept of transportation began with a family-operated ferry service. In 1630, the Massachusetts Court of Assistants, the Colony's Legislature, sought to improve access to the mainland by offering a charter to anyone who would run a ferry between Boston and Charlestown. Thomas Williams decided to start the first chartered transportation service on the continent. The ferry sailed from Chelsea to Charlestown and on to Boston. Sail and row boats were the primary means of transporting freight and passengers on the three-mile stretch. It was generally family owned and operated, except for the times when economic depression demanded government subsidy, and for brief periods when City of Boston-appointed trustees stepped in to supervise.

Mass transportation began its rich history in 1631, when Boston was a peninsula connected to the mainland by a narrow strip of land. This geographic location is now called the South End. It was difficult to transport freight by ox cart, considering there were no bridges and there was limited access to the mainland. For example, to transport freight by ox cart from Winnisimet (Chelsea) to Boston it would take a two day journey through Malden, Cambridge, Brighton, and Roxbury. Most could not afford horses and


wagons, so they would remain in the borders and travel by foot. After the establishment of independent colonies and the increase in population, the city began to expand. The increase in population prohibited people from traversing the city by foot. The ferry service continued, but there were new bridges built to connect Boston to communities across the harbor and the Charles River. The people of Boston needed more, they needed land transportation to get to Roxbury, East Cambridge, and nearby communities.

The Boston Peninsula attracted any new settlers immediately after the United States recovered from the American Revolution. The omnibus was soon developed connecting Boston to such towns as Roxbury, East Cambridge, Charlestown, and other nearby communities. In 1832, New York City developed another form of mass transportation that involved horses hauling larger or heavier loads of passengers in coaches more smoothly over rails - two parallel rails set in streets. A hundred years ago, streets were full of ruts, mud and bumps, but the use of a car on rails assured a more comfortable ride, and horses could pull greater loads at much higher speeds. Initially, Bostonians did not agree with the laying of rails in their neighborhood streets. That opinion eventually changed, and resulted in competition between horsecar and omnibus

96 Ibid.

97 Ibid.

operation.  

On March 26, 1856 the first horsecar line started operation from Central Square, Cambridge to the West Boston Bridge to Bowdoin Square. Shortly afterwards, there were at least twenty different horsecar companies offering service to Boston and surrounding communities. The system was not supervised properly, resulting in an over-duplication of existing services, unregulated fares, and a fierce competition for passengers. The General Court of Massachusetts eventually passed the West End Consolidation Act (Act of 1887, Chapter 413) consolidating all lines into one operation to be known as the West End Street Railway, leading to the creation of one of the largest street railway operations in the United States during that time period. With new forms of mass transportation being developed, most street railway managements were constantly seeking new sources of motive power. Speed was becoming a priority. Like automobiles and forms of transportation, horses require maintenance as well. The West End's concerns came with the maintenance and health of approximately 8,000 horses, and clogged streets with all forms of traffic.100

During the 19th Century, larger cities such as Washington D.C., Kansas City, and Los Angeles all had large-scale cable car operations similar to that of San Francisco’s. Boston proposed having two cablecar lines: line one would travel through the South End and Roxbury along Washington Street, and line two would start at Bowdoin Square,

---


100 Ibid.
proceed down Cambridge Street, across the West Boston Bridge to Main Street, onto Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge and into Harvard Square.\textsuperscript{101}

The West End Company management was hesitant about the development of the cable cars and took into consideration the high costs of cablecar construction, its maintenance, and New England winters. The management team traveled to Richmond, Virginia to study a new technology, electrification. Electrification was currently being used by the Union Passenger Railway Company. The rest would become transportation history.\textsuperscript{102} The Hub's transit system is the oldest and fourth largest in the nation has a history longer than that of American independence.\textsuperscript{103}

The MBTA administration consists of a five member Board of Directors. The five-member Board of Directors was appointed by the Governor with expertise in transportation, finance and engineering to oversee the new Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT). This Board is the governing body of both MassDOT and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), which is a part of MassDOT but will retain a separate legal existence. MassDOT is administered by a Secretary of Transportation, appointed by the Governor to serve as Chief Executive Officer. The organization oversees four new divisions: Highway, Mass Transit, Aeronautics and the

\textsuperscript{101} Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, “About the MBTA: History”, http://www.mbta.com/about_the_mbtap/about_the_mbtahistory/\textsuperscript{id=958}, (accessed March 2, 2012).

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{103} Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, “About the MBTA: History”, http://www.mbta.com/about_the_mbtap/about_the_mbtahistory/, (accessed March 2, 2012).
THE HISTORY OF COBB COUNTY TRANSIT

Cobb Community Transit (CCT) is the only public transportation option throughout Cobb County and access to downtown Atlanta via Fixed, Express or Paratransit services. CCT strives to provide a transit network that is convenient, accessible, customer-focused, safe, reliable and efficient. CCT provides complementary curb to curb paratransit service to individuals who cannot use the regular CCT bus. In order to ride, passengers must be certified to use paratransit service. Similar to MARTA, CCT operates eight Park & Ride Lots. The lots locations are throughout the county for the convenience of its patrons: Acworth Park & Ride, Busbee Park & Ride, Floyd Road Park & Ride, Hiram 278 Theatre Park & Ride, Mableton Park & Ride, Marietta Park & Ride, Powder Springs Park & Ride, and Town Center Park & Ride.

---


**COBB COUNTY TRANSIT FARES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Local Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Local Single Ride Ticket</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior and Disabled Cash Fare</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Cash Fare</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Express Cash Fare</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Express Single Ride Ticket</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Local Ticket</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Local Ticket</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Ride Express Ticket</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Day Express Ticket</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Cash Fare</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Single Ride Ticket</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit 10-Ride Ticket</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit 31-Day Ticket</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Card</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CCT Fares Effective October 3, 2011*

**THE HISTORY OF GWINNETT COUNTY TRANSIT**

**MISSION**

The mission of the Gwinnett County Department of Transportation is to enhance quality of life by facilitating the mobility of people and goods safely and efficiently. This mission is accomplished by planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining the

---

aviation, transit and surface transportation systems.\textsuperscript{109}

VISION

The Gwinnett County Department of Transportation will, in a fiscally responsible manner, provide for the mobility and accessibility needs of the wide variety of citizens. To meet these needs, the Department will rely upon established, proven methods, while continuously considering innovative techniques and solutions. Whether traveling by private automobile, aircraft, as a passenger in a transit vehicle, or as a pedestrian, Gwinnett County citizens will be able to reach any desired destination in a safe and timely manner. Gwinnett County will be bold in its actions by pursuing alternative funding sources and technological advances. Gwinnett County will be known as the place with smooth roads, synchronized traffic signals, maintained shoulders, safe and well-designed intersections, accessible pedestrian facilities, live interactive traffic information, and a clean, efficient transit system.\textsuperscript{110}

VALUES

Integrity: We believe in treating each other and the public in an honest and ethical manner.

Stewardship: We take our duties of safety and fiscal management to be two of our prime responsibilities.


\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
Teamwork: While we recognize our individual strengths, we believe our strength comes from working in unified efforts with a number of partners, whether local, regional or national.

Quality: We promote safety, cost-efficiency, innovation, and service excellence.\textsuperscript{111}

Formed in 2000, Gwinnett County Transit's intent was to provide express, local, and paratransit services for the people of Gwinnett County. Express bus service operates Monday through Friday and includes six routes using the HOT lane on I-85. GCT has built park and ride lots at I-985, Discover Mills, and Indian Trail in order to provide free and convenient parking for bus riders. Local bus service operates five routes Monday through Friday and Route 10 on Saturday connecting neighborhoods and businesses to Gwinnett County's many cultural, shopping and educational opportunities. Paratransit service for qualifying persons with disabilities operates in conjunction with the local bus service.\textsuperscript{112}

The Transit Division is responsible for implementation, marketing, development and service oversight of public transit within Gwinnett County. This includes ensuring a safe and efficient transit system by directing and coordinating all aspects of development and maintenance of short, intermediate and long-range plans for public transit in the County. The Division 's duties also include monitoring existing fares, routes and schedules, and facilitating the safe and secure delivery of transit that conforms to all

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.

federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations.113

GCT along with our Regional Transit Partners will be rerouting all Express buses in downtown Atlanta due to the Atlanta Streetcar Project. This rerouting will remain permanent in order to accommodate the Streetcar project and to reduce congestion on Peachtree Street.114 GCT requires a fare for all passengers without any discounts. On Local service only, children shorter than the height of GCT’s fare box ride free when accompanied by a fare-paying customer.115 Transfers within GCT are free for 1.5 hours from the start of a trip, for up to three transfers, where the current route is different from the last route. Transfer fees apply when transferring to a higher fared service. All passengers are required to use a Breeze Card to transfer free from GCT to MARTA and vice versa.116

Gwinnett County's paratransit service is a specialized transportation service of Gwinnett County Transit (GCT), which provides curb-to-curb shared ride bus service (and extends further upon request) for eligible persons with disabilities. GCT runs this service complimentary in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of

113 Gwinnett County, GA, “Transit Management”,

114 Gwinnett County, GA, “Gwinnett County Transit”,

115 Gwinnett County, GA, “General Information”,

116 Ibid.
Eligibility of GCT paratransit service is made available to the following groups of people:

- Persons who are unable to board, ride or disembark from a fixed-route bus, regardless of their ability to get to a bus stop or availability of accessible vehicles.
- Persons with specific impairments who cannot travel to a bus stop to board the fixed-route bus, or travel to their final destination after disembarking from the fixed-route bus.

In order to become eligible, you must apply for certification. A licensed professional (e.g., physician, therapist, social worker, etc.) must certify your eligibility application. Gwinnett County will make all final eligibility determinations. The GCT paratransit only operates in Gwinnett County in 3/4-mile radius on either side of each local bus route. GCT operates an advanced reservation service for paratransit trips, which requires reservation to be made a day in advance. There are no daily limits on the number of reservations you can request. However, reservations for a round trip should be given a two hour window between the requested pick-up times. GCT paratransit service does not provide emergency or same day transportation, nor does it alter same day trip times or locations.

---


118 Ibid.
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EXPRESS SERVICE FARES: ZONE 1 (ROUTE 102, 4101, & 103A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Cash</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Ticket Book</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONE 2 ( ROUTES 101, 103, 412, AND 418)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Cash</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Ticket Book</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL SERVICE FARES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Cash</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Ticket Book</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

120 Gwinnett County, GA, “Passess and Tickets”,
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HALF FARE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Cash (Local)</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Book (Local)</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Persons 65 or older, persons with disabilities, and persons with Medicare cards.123

PARATRANSPORT SERVICE FARES (ADA ELIGIBLE RIDERS)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Way Cash</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Ride Ticket Book</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care Attendant</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling Companion</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE BUCKHEAD UPTOWN CONNECTION (THE “BUC”)

The Buckhead Uptown Connection “The Buc” has been in operation since 2003. It is a community shuttle service designed to provide fast, free, and frequent connections between area hotels, restaurants, offices, shopping destinations and MARTA rail in Buckhead.125 The Buc is responsible for the following:

- Connect you directly to MARTA’s rail service - making commuting to work using transit even easier!

123 Ibid.

124 Ibid.

• Provide a new way for Buckhead’s residents, visitors and workers to get to and from meetings, conventions, lunch and shopping destinations
• Allow you to leave the driving to someone else — reducing stress and road rage.
• Make it easier for those without a car (carpoolers and vanpoolers) to get about during the day.\textsuperscript{126}

The Buc is supported by $154,032 of funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.\textsuperscript{127} The Buc is funded by The Buckhead Community Improvement District, The Georgia Regional Transit Authority "GRTA", and The Buckhead Area Transportation Management Association "BATMA". The Buckhead Community Improvement District is a self taxing entity created voluntarily by area property owners. This community committed $1.5 million to the initial system startup and continues to provide annual support of $1 million to the system. The Georgia Regional Transit Authority "GRTA" serves as the conduit for federal funding that comes to the system.\textsuperscript{128}

The Buckhead Area Transportation Management Association "BATMA" is non-profit organization dedicated to promoting alternative modes of travel. BATMA oversees the system and guided the development of the system. The BATMA consist of Denise Starling, Buckhead Area Transportation Management Association (Manager), Eric Cox, American Coach Lines, Inc. (General Manager), April Johnson, American Coach Lines,

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.


Inc. (Daily Supervisor), and Tony Peters, (Business Development Manager). The Buc system is operated by American Coach Lines, Inc. There is no cost to ride The Buc. Local tax dollars, as well as federal funding support it. In order to connect from one system to another system such as MARTA, you will be required to pay the fare for that system.\textsuperscript{129}

THE BIRTH OF THE ATLANTA STREET CAR

The long-term vision for the proposed streetcar includes a north-to-south route from the Brookhaven MARTA station to Fort McPherson and an east-to-west route connecting The King Center to the Centennial Olympic Park area west of Peachtree Street. Initial funding will kick start the first phase, focusing on the Downtown east-west route. As they become available, additional federal funding opportunities will be pursued to further fund the streetcar’s expansion. Key features of the streetcar include:

• Potential for higher passenger loads
• Draw new transit riders
• Produces fewer emissions, impacting air quality and sustainability
• Reduces dependence on cars in a significant live-and-work corridor
• Appeals to visitors with its predictable fixed route
• Potential to increase ridership on connecting transit network\textsuperscript{130}

The Atlanta Streetcar and the Beltline project are complementary elements of the City’s Connect Atlanta Plan to increase urban mobility, sustainable development and livability.

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid.

of the city of Atlanta. For more information on the Beltline, visit Beltline project.\textsuperscript{131}

Project Characteristics:

- 2.7 track miles
- 12 stops
- 4 vehicles
- 15-minute frequency
- Free transfer to/from MARTA
- \textit{Breeze} smartcard fare collection system using MARTA fare policy\textsuperscript{132}

### PROPOSED OPERATING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>5:00 AM to 11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8:30 AM to 11:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 AM to 10:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation Work Begins</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design-Build Contract Awarded</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Begins</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Quarter 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Vehicle Delivered</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Event to Showcase Vehicle and System</td>
<td>October 2012\textsuperscript{134}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid.
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INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING SHUTTLE SERVICES

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY’S PANTHEREXPRESS SHUTTLE

Georgia State University operates the Panther Express shuttle system. The Panther Express bus stops are equipped with signs that display anticipated arrival times for buses. PantherExpress shuttles feature automated passenger lift accessibility equipment.135

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY CENTER’S SHUTTLE

(CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, INTERDENOMINATIONAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MOREHOUSE COLLEGE, & SPELMAN COLLEGE)

Atlanta University Center students, faculty and staff can enjoy both safe and convenient transport between the Library, campuses and surrounding MARTA stations. In order to use the shuttle service, persons must present a valid Atlanta University Center member institution ID.136 There are two routes running continuously, Southbound and Northbound. The Southbound Route starts at Vine City MARTA station, stops at all campuses and the Library, and ends at the West End MARTA station. The Northbound Route runs in the opposite direction, starting at the West End MARTA station and ending at the Vine City MARTA station. Passenger pick up and drop off are limited to

---


designated stops. During the fall and spring semesters, with the exception of break periods and holidays, the shuttles operate every hour the Robert W. Woodruff Library is open. The shuttles do not operate when the Library is closed. The final shuttle of the day leaves the Library 10 minutes after the day’s scheduled closing time.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND EMORY UNIVERSITY’S SHUTTLE SERVICE

Georgia Institute of Technology offers a free direct shuttle service is provided for transportation between the Biomedical Engineering department offices on each campus, during the fall and spring terms. The direct shuttle is not in operation but the Emory Cliff Shuttle is available, during the summer term. The Emory Cliff Shuttle includes service between the main campus and Emory Hospital Midtown, which is close to Georgia Tech’s campus.

THE HISTORY OF CLIFF SHUTTLES

The Cliff shuttles are responsible for providing service for the various Emory University campuses (Clifton Road campus, the Clairmont campus, the Briarcliff campus), Executive Park, Emory University Hospital Midtown, Grady Memorial Hospital and commuter Park-and-Ride lots. There is also a Cliff Shuttle that stops at

---
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Civic Center MARTA Station. Xpress commuters may transfer to the Cliff Shuttle for transportation to Emory University. Park-and-Ride shuttles offer regular weekday service linking North DeKalb Mall and South DeKalb Mall with Emory's Druid Hills campus. Listed below are some of the features the Cliff shuttles have to offer:

- All Cliff shuttles are accessible to persons with mobility impairments.
- Most Cliff shuttles have bike racks on the front of the bus for cyclists.
- All Cliff shuttles are fueled by electricity, natural gas, or biodiesel.

HOT LANES, HOV LANES, AND BELTLINE

In November of 2008, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) awarded a $110 million Congestion Reduction Demonstration (CRD) Program grant to the Atlanta region, changing High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) lanes to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. Only the HOV lanes along the I-85 corridor were converted to express lanes. The state of Georgia is experiencing extraordinary growths in population and its political leaders have taken notice. As a result, they recognize that new and innovative approaches are needed to address the mobility and travel demand challenges it faces. One of many solutions Georgia is studying to improve its statewide transportation
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network is the HOT lanes combined with value pricing.\textsuperscript{144}

Value pricing is the method of charging drivers a toll for using congested roads or designated lanes of a road during periods of heaviest use. The fee will be set dynamically to maintain free-flowing traffic and provide reliable trip times. The fee is lower or not applicable during off-peak times or when the lanes are able to handle more capacity. The HOT lane conversions require minimal construction, resulting in one of the most cost-efficient improvements available to Georgia.\textsuperscript{145} The HOT lanes are limited-access managed lanes that allow eligible carpoolers, transit, motorcycles and Alternative Fuel Vehicles to use lane for free, while allowing previously ineligible solo drivers to buy back into the lane for a fee. The number of cars using these lanes can be controlled through value pricing via electronic toll collection so as to maintain free-flowing traffic in them at all times, even during the height of rush hours.\textsuperscript{146}

The funding includes improvements to public transit in the corridor with the addition of 36 new 57-passenger coaches, several new express coach routes and two new Park-and-Ride lots that will create 1,900 additional parking spaces.\textsuperscript{147} The approximately 15-mile section of I-85 is envisioned to be the first phase of an expanded HOT network in the state that will:


\textsuperscript{145} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.
• Provide commuters with a more reliable, free-flow commute option;

• Complement the state’s multi-modal approach to managing traffic demand;

• Establish the vision for a future system of HOT lanes in the region.\textsuperscript{148}

There are currently successful HOT lanes in operation in Orange County, California; San Diego; Houston; Denver; Salt Lake City; Minneapolis, Miami and Seattle. More are planned in the Capital Beltway (Washington, DC and Northern Virginia), Maryland (on I-95), Austin, Dallas, the San Francisco Bay Area, Raleigh-Durham and Portland.\textsuperscript{149}

The goal of this project is to promote commute alternatives. For example, in San Diego, carpooling and transit use increased after the I-15 HOT lane was implemented. The free-flow of traffic in the HOT lane encouraged commuters to take transit or form carpools or vanpools to use the lane for free or share the fee. This will prompt commuters to ride in vanpools or in buses to gain shorter and more reliable trip times in the HOT lane.\textsuperscript{150} In order to maintain operational efficiency and ensure reliable trip time, the availability of federal funding for the program will be based on the usage of HOT lane by buses and passenger vehicles that contain at least three occupants. Vehicles with less than three occupants may use the HOT lanes for a fee. The State Transportation Board passed a resolution in March 2009 to change HOV occupancy requirements from 2 passengers to 3 passengers. This change was made to ensure optimal use of the lane and

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid.
provide more reliable trip times.\textsuperscript{151}

HOT lanes will be tolled using technology similar to the Cruise Card electronic transponders used on Georgia 400 today. Instead of paying a toll at a booth, the accounts of registered users will be read and/or debited every time they use a HOT lane. Those who choose to use the lane will register in advance and use a transponder to pay their tolls.\textsuperscript{152} HOT lanes will be enforced using the latest technology in video tolling enforcement systems, along with visual patrols by law enforcement. Motorists will be considered violators in the lane subject to penalty if they:

a) Fail to pay the toll;

b) Do not meet occupancy requirements; and/or

c) Cross the double white line.\textsuperscript{153}

The funds generated will be used to defray the costs of construction, operations and maintenance of the lanes. Long term revenue allocation is being studied and a decision about future excess revenues will be made later in the project process.\textsuperscript{154}

The notion of the Atlanta BeltLine began in 1999 as the master’s thesis of Ryan Gravel, a Georgia Tech graduate student. It consists of already existing 22-mile historic rail corridor that encircles the City of Atlanta as its foundation. Pedestrian friendly rail transit and 33 miles of multi-use trails will follow this corridor and spur off from it. The goal of the Atlanta BeltLine is to bring together 45 intown neighborhoods and also link

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{153} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid.
them to the entire metropolitan Atlanta region through a collection of transit offerings. The transit component of the Atlanta BeltLine is critical for long-term transportation initiatives benefiting everyone in the entire metro Atlanta region and beyond. The Atlanta BeltLine will have several attractions such as three trail segments, four spectacular new or renovated parks, and new affordable housing. More work will be done, but it will occur in phases over the next two decades.\textsuperscript{155}

THE REGIME THEORY

According to Gerry Stoker, the Regime Theory has a direct correlation with study of urban politics and the issue of power. It focuses on the correlation of governmental and non-governmental efforts in meeting economic and social challenges that focus attention upon the problem of cooperation and coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors. Differences tend to arise whether it’s a communist or capitalist society. There are significant differences persist from country to country, thus the need for some of public/private cooperation must exists. The issue of governance emerges in a range of policy areas: economic development, human capital and training programs, crime prevention, environmental protection and anti-drug campaigns. Regime theory is relevant, because it emphasizes the way governmental and non-governmental actors work across boundaries with respect to the shifting role of urban government.\textsuperscript{156}

\begin{footnotes}

\end{footnotes}
Clarence Stone comments that 'regime theory has many antecedents'. The work of Fainstein and Fainstein, and Jones and Bachelor, and Elkin would seem particularly relevant in the context of urban politics. According to Elkin:

The way in which popular control operates in contemporary cities is largely a consequence of the division of labour between state and market as that is manifest in cities. The division, which stems from the corresponding arrangement if the national political economy, means that ownership of productive assets in the city is largely placed in private hands. Public officials share responsibility for the level of citizen well-being with these private controllers, but these officials cannot command economic performance, only induce it. The concern of public officials with citizen well-being stems largely from their being subject to election or appointment by those who themselves have been elected.\(^{157}\)

Regime theory takes as given a set of government institutions subject to some degree of popular control and an economy guided mainly but not exclusively by privately controlled investment decisions. A regime is a set of 'arrangements by which this division of labor is bridged.'\(^{158}\) In reference to this research, the regime would be the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority's two teams, The Executive Management Team and the Board of Directors.

David Judge argues that regime theorists have taken on board the central thrust of much Marxist inspired work of the 1970s, more specifically that business control over investment decisions and resources central to societal welfare give it a privileged position in relation to government decision making. This means that business control over any decisions made about investment and/or resources that are central to the society's well-being is more of a privilege and not an entitlement, whereas it is the responsibility of the


government to make decisions for societal welfare. Judge goes further to state that 'public officials form their alliances, make their decisions and plan their futures in a context in which strategically important resources are hierarchically arranged...Systemic power therefore has to do with the impact of the larger socioeconomic system on the predispositions of public officials'.

Regime theorist argue that the organization of politics leads to very inadequate forms of popular control and makes government less responsive to socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. Elkin argues ‘the roots of the city’s failures are not in the necessity of earning its keep but in how that impulse gets translated into action’. Therefore, the city has no one to blame for its failures but itself. Ultimately, what ever you invest is what you produce (outcomes). He also believes that urban politics suffers not only from a systematic basis in the benefits provided to certain interests but also is undermined by failures in social intelligence. Regime theory correlates with the ‘neopluralists’. There is great evidence shown by urban field regime writers. Dahl and Lindblom’s contest that pluralists in the urban world have rather developed hyperpluralist visions, which sit rather uncomfortably alongside the thrust of ‘nep-pluralists’ and regime arguments.

What lures scholars and theorists to regime theory is that it begins to address

---
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similar questions, which align with common ground it shares with 'neo-pluralists'.

- What are the implications of social complexity for politics?
- What does the systematic advantage of certain interests imply for the nature of urban politics?
- What forms of power dominate modern systems of urban governance?
- What role is there for democratic politics and the role of disadvantaged groups?162

Complexity is key to the regime perspective, in which institutions and actors are involved in an extremely complex web of relationships. The study of regime politics focuses on how these limited segments or domains of command power combine forces and resources for 'publicly significant result' - a policy initiative or development. Politics is about government working with and alongside other institutions and interests and about how in that process certain ideas and interests prevail.163 The point is that 'to be effective, governments must blend their capacities with those of various non-governmental actors'.164

Governmental and non-governmental actors typically form regimes in response to social change and to combat conflict. A regime can also be defined as 'an informal yet relatively stable group with access to institutional resources that enable it to have a sustained role in making governing decisions'.165 Regimes are generally formed as an

---
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informally without the formal hierarchy. Regime Theory does not focus specifically on
direction and control, however its focus is on efforts to build more stable and intense
relationships in order that governmental and non-governmental actors can accomplish
difficult and non-routine goals. Stone references power as a form of social production
rather than social control.\(^{166}\)

There are two groups that are seen by the US-based regime literature as the key
participants in most localities: elected officials and business. Aside from elected officials
and business there are other community interests such as minorities, neighborhoods or
even organized labor. In regime theory there is a government-interest group that serves
as the mediator between government and the citizens. Like any organization with
structure and a mission, regime theory views power as structured to gain certain kinds of
outcomes within particular fields of governmental endeavor. Regimes may also practice
a politics of exclusion, seeking to ensure that certain interests are not provided with
access to decision making. Generally all regimes have to develop strategies for coping
with the wider political environment.\(^{167}\) This means that there are restricted areas in the
decision making process that are placed on certain individuals and/or institutions. For
example, adjunct professors do not possess voting power during faculty senate meetings
in higher education.

---

\(^{165}\) David Judge, Gerry Stoker, and Harold Wolman, "Theories of Urban Politics", p 58-59, SAGE

\(^{166}\) David Judge, Gerry Stoker, and Harold Wolman, "Theories of Urban Politics", p 59, SAGE

\(^{167}\) David Judge, Gerry Stoker, and Harold Wolman, "Theories of Urban Politics", p 60, SAGE
The main object of regime formation is to gain a shared sense of purpose and direction. This sense of purpose and direction manifests an understanding of what is feasible and what is not. Feasibility favors linking with resource-rich actors and some goals over others whose achievements may be more intractable and problematic. The 'iron law' governs regime formation. In order for governing coalition to be viable, it must be able to mobilize resources commensurate with its main policy agenda. This 'iron law' is then operationalized by Stone to identify four types of regime to be found in American cities.168

- Maintenance Regimes
- Development Regimes
- Middle-class Regimes
- Lower Class Opportunity Expansion Regimes

Maintenance regimes seek no major change but rather to preserve what is. This type of regime is strictly based on a relationship between government officials and non-governmental actors their commitment to routine service delivery. A development regime in contrast needs more resources and is attempting a more complex governing task. The development regime's tasks focus on the promotion growth in the effort to avoid any negative impacts. Middle-class progressive regimes in contrast seek environmental protection and control over growth and/or social gains from growth. Their intent to make sure everyone is safe in such a rapidly growing environment and that the growth process is beneficial to all. Finally Stone identifies lower class opportunity expansion regimes which in order to achieve their ends require substantial mass

mobilization. These lower class opportunity expansion regimes tend to lack resources and coordination, but require these things in order to be successful.169

Regime theory according to Stone: ‘holds that public policies are shaped by three factors: (1) the composition of a community’s governing coalition, (2) the nature of the relationships among members of the governing coalition, and (3) the resources that members bring to the governing coalition’. 170

According to Judge, “Pluralists regimes are dominated by strong political leaders who bring together a mixed, diffuse and competitive set of private actors. Elitist regimes are run primarily by strong cohesive business elite with weak political leaders taken along with them. Corporatist regimes combine both strong political leaders, who set their own agenda, and a unified business elite, who knows what it wants. The final category is the hyperpluralist regime in which ‘neither political leader or private actors are powerful enough to pull together the strings of the urban political economy’. The direction of change within city politics is seen as ‘towards some kind of pluralists or hyperpluralist system’.”171

Plainly Savitch and Thomas mean their analysis to capture broad trends. “First, no explanation is offered as to why certain political leaders or business elites are strong or cohesive. This implication is made based solely on the premise that if political leaders
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are strong, then strong political leaders will dominate that city's politics. Second, no regime analysis is provided of the nature of the partnership forged between governmental or non-governmental leaders. They go on to question the corporatist regime on how is it that political and business elites are able to agree a joint agenda form their own clear defined and strong-held positions? Third, no effective distinction is made between power exercise as social control and power as social production. Fourth, the term regime is used as a convenient descriptive label for any political system whereas in Stone's analysis a regime is a particular type of long-term stable relationship between governmental and non-governmental partners.” This questions whether Savitch and Thomas' analysis fits into Stone's definition of regime. "Finally, the identification of pluralists and in particular hyperpluralist tendencies in city politics by Savitch and Thomas overlooks the claim of regime analysis that beyond the surface of fragmented and disjointed interest group actors may be formed that gives its members a 'pre-emptive occupancy of a strategic role'.”

Stone's study of Atlanta provides an account of Atlanta's policies between 1946 and 1988. He draws attention to the two groups that dominate the regime: the downtown business elite and the political force. The downtown business elite operated and structured itself to have a single voice. The banks, the utilities, the major department stores, the daily newspapers, and Coca Cola, for example are the ones that influences new businesses in Atlanta to follow suit. The other main coalition partner is the political force represented by black mayors in the context of the emerging postwar black electoral majority in the city. The black middle class tends to manipulate this political resource for

---

its benefit. Both of these two groups weighed the pros and cons of working together and how both would benefit from the proposed opportunities. Business was more attracted to the economic success and expansion, while the black middle-class was attracted to the selective incentives of high quality housing, employment and small-business opportunities.\textsuperscript{173} The Atlanta regime was thereby imbued ‘with a means to achieve [a] publicly significant result that an otherwise divided and fragmented system of authority could not provide’.\textsuperscript{174}

The regime approach is premised on the view that power in urban politics can be observed in at least four forms of power: systemic power, command power, coalition power, and pre-emptive power. The first is systematic power, which is available to certain interests because of their position in the socioeconomic structure. This means that the power they possess is power that is granted with the position being occupied, a part of the job description. A participant need not make a conscious effort to obtain a structurally advantaged position for that position to be power relevant. Further the participant need not be aware of the particular consequences of their power position. One must not seek a position in order to gain power, nor should he/she be concerned with the consequences that may occur in the position. Systemic power reflects the advantages and disadvantages conferred on certain groups in society based on their position within the socioeconomic structure.\textsuperscript{175}


The second form of power is command power. Power in this sense involves the active mobilization of resources to achieve domination over other interests: ‘The emphasis is, therefore, on one actor’s capacity to achieve compliance and the other’s capacity to resist’. Regime theory argues, however, that command power typically only extends over a limited domain and a restricted set of activities in most urban politics. This means that command power has limitations and restrictions, and can only be exercised where permissible. 176

Judge’s third power source is coalition power. It involves actors not seeking to dominate but rather to bargain on the basis of their respective autonomous basis of strength. The bargaining is only possible if the other parties shares common goals, objectives and have comparable resources. Coalitional arrangements usually do not sustain. Systemic, command and coalitional power are all seen as having a role in urban politics. 177 Pre-emptive is a very valuable part of regime theory. It is dependent upon leadership from those that form coalitions. Power is intended to build a regime and achieve governance. Pre-emptive power is intentional and active.178

Regime theory contends that certain interests are at an advantage when it comes to building regimes-those with systemic power and those with resources associated with
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command power. In order for it to become pre-emptive power the strategic position has to be manipulated and the resources have to be seized, resulting in a long-term coalition. These steps will help 'to guide the community’s policy responses to social change and alter the terms on which social cooperation takes place'. A regime once established is a powerful force in urban politics. Opponents ‘have to go along to get along’ or face the daunting task of building an effective counter-regime.179 There are many instances in life when someone does not want to do something, but in order for things to work out for the good you do them.

According to Judge, "Urban regime analysis holds that public policies are shaped by the composition, relationships and resources of the community’s governing coalition. It also acknowledges the way that the socioeconomic environment frames the options open to the governing coalition and how federal grants or state-level policies are necessary to make certain options feasible." Regimes appear throughout environments: the national and local environments. Local regimes have the ability to be prosperous given they branch out and extend contacts to non-local powers and resources, possibly resulting in constrain or influence in any direction. Regimes need to be placed in the architecture of governmental complexity. According to Keating:

"The wider political context is critical in determining the terms of the relationship. The central state can be oppressive, or it can be a resource allowing localities to escape other forms of dependence...This in turn, depends on the weight of local elites in the national political system and their ability to forge coalitions to extract resources on their own terms."180

Orr and Stoker propose a model of regime transition, which gives recognition to the

---
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influence of non-local forces - reflecting broader shifts in the political and economic environment - as well as the internal dynamics of coalition building. They divide regime transition into three stages. The first stage revolves around the questioning of the established regime. Doubts may be raised about its capacity and about the goals it is pursuing. Such questions are most likely to be raised where developments in the wider environment appear to contradict or challenge the established regime. The second stage involves a conflict about redefining the scope and purpose of the regime. Here competing groups of elite actors may organize to seek new ways forward and a new policy direction. This stage is where uncertainty and debate will arise. A third stage involves the institutionalization of the new regime. The institutionalization of a new regime involves the establishment of a new set of material incentives and ideological outlook.\textsuperscript{181} In the third stage new incentives and goals will be discussed, developed, and implemented.\textsuperscript{182}

GOVERNOR NATHAN DEAL ON TRANSPORTATION

“Transportation has continually been one of the most important issues facing Georgia and the Atlanta region, both to the public and to the business community,” said Michael Meyer, a civil engineering professor and director of the Georgia Transportation Institute at Georgia Tech. “Transportation needs to be at or near the top of the list of the incoming governor.”\textsuperscript{183}


According to Governor Nathan Deal’s official campaign website, "Transportation is a critical issue for our state. Each and every day, Georgians spend valuable time commuting and combating congestion. This is not just an economic issue but a quality of life issue as well. Georgia's east to west connectivity is insufficient forcing thousands of extra vehicles onto metro Atlanta roads. Alternative routes must be explored to remove more than 100,000 transfer trucks from metropolitan roadways each day and significantly relieve congestion and delays as a result. While finding funds to service and expand our existing roadways has been difficult, Nathan supports and applauds the regional approach adopted in this most recent legislative session as a way to allow communities to prioritize and fund their transportation needs. From this regional approach to encouraging public-private initiatives, Nathan believes that we must provide the public with a full range of transportation options to meet our transportation and commercial goals."  

Georgia Tea Party groups urged Governor Nathan Deal to repeal a law that allows Georgians to vote on a one-cent transportation tax. They were in opposition towards it, because if the referendum passes, it will create a new tax. The Tea Party groups stated that Gov. Deal and other top Republicans signed a pledge opposing any increase in taxes, but Deal has betrayed that pledge by supporting a referendum allowing Georgians to vote on a regional transportation tax. During a rally at the Capitol, Noland Cox, a Valdosta tea party supporter, questioned Deal’s support for the vote.185

According to Brian Robinson, Deal’s spokesman, says the law permitting the vote passed before the Governor took office, and that Georgians should have a chance to vote for themselves. Robinson says, “Every region of the state will get their own little vote, 


each region can decide if the project list that has been put forward by local officials – not by the Governor, not by the state – is good for their region."\textsuperscript{186} Individual transportation tax referenda will take place in 12 regions of Georgia in July, tied to a specific list of transit, infrastructure, highway and sidewalk projects. Robinson also stated, "There's no other pool of money to pay for the types of transit and infrastructure improvements funded by the tax that would help attract world-class companies to Georgia and the Governor is not pushing a new tax but rather seeking to close a loophole on an existing levy."\textsuperscript{187}

On August 10, 2011, Gov. Deal was asked whether the state regional transportation sales tax referendum scheduled for 2012 is in trouble, as some believe. If the measure passes the sales tax would be imposed for ten years and it would fund projects that voters would know about before they approve the money. Gov. Deal replied, "I don't necessarily think that it is. Obviously, anytime in an economy like we have now getting people to understand that an additional one penny is going to be asked of them is a very significant undertaking. But by the same token, I think this is a unique opportunity for Georgians to have a say in the transportation and transit projects that they think are important in their part of the state."\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{188} Klein, Mike, "Governor Deal Asked, Is Transportation Sales Tax In Trouble?" \url{http://mikekleinonline.com/2011/08/10/governor-deal-asked-is-transportation-sales-tax-in-trouble/}, (accessed May 7, 2012).
Governor Nathan Deal spoke recently at the Atlanta Press Club in downtown Atlanta, where he discussed recent legislative achievements and encouraged Atlantans to support this summer's regional transportation referendum. He referred to his tax reform package and the criminal justice overhaul as the most important of the legislative session. The tax overhaul is intended to lower taxes for married couples, create a new internet sales tax, and eliminate the annual ad valorem tax on vehicles, also known as the "birthday tax". One of the most critical provisions is a new tax break on equipment and energy for manufacturers, resulting in companies like Caterpillar coming to the state of Georgia.189

In recognition of transportation, Gov. Nathan Deal is appointing a political adviser as the state's transportation planning director. Toby Carr will have perhaps the strongest hand in choosing what projects get funded with large chunks of the state's $2 billion annual gas tax budget. Carr served as the former director of the Georgia Republican Party. He will be replacing Todd Long who was a career engineer and transportation planner. Long was appointed by Gov. Sonny Perdue and continued to serve under the Deal Administration. He has since been promoted to deputy commissioner of the state Department of Transportation.190


Carr's appointment highlights the role of politics in transportation funding, and may set up the first real test of a new law that reformed transportation governance in 2009. The law passed in 2009 shifted some power over transportation money from the DOT board to the governor, by creating the director of planning, making that person report to the governor and giving him or her the first hand in creating state project lists. DOT board chairman Rudy Bowen said he liked working with Carr. "I think it's a great choice from the governor's office," Bowen said. "He's a very capable young man." Bowen does not believe Carr would make transportation choices any more political than they already are, and he noted that the DOT board will still have its vote over the projects.

Before the 2009 law, there were bitter fights over the years between the DOT board and governors over transportation planning. After the law, the governor's planning director and the DOT board have worked together smoothly, aided partly by Long's experience as an engineer and his background at the DOT. The law was also intended to engage governors more closely in transportation planning, spurring better cooperation with the DOT board and less conflict. The law could also do the opposite, setting up a structure for conflict by giving one politician a lot of control over a large pot of project money, but not total control. As the state's second-ever transportation planning director, Carr's role is to balance power over the money with the DOT board. The DOT
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board is independent, with each of 13 members elected by a caucus of legislators.\textsuperscript{193}

\textbf{MAYOR KASIM REED ON TRANSPORTATION}

According to Atlanta’s Mayor Kasim Reed, “We’re being strangled by the lack of action at the federal level. That’s why mayors are where the action is.” He was at a high-end forum in attendance with Houston Mayor Annise Parker and New York Deputy Mayor Robert Steel.\textsuperscript{194}

“If you look at the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, less than 10 percent of those dollars went into cities, where 80 percent of GDP occurs,” he said. “We’re going to have to shift national politics, and we’re going to have to shift state politics. Governors have a better lobby than mayors do. That’s why they got 90 percent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, when that money should have gone to cities. Because we deploy it faster, we’re more creative, and we’re more representative of the majority of the United States of America.”\textsuperscript{195}

Federal transportation spending avoided a shut-down through a 90-day extension of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act which expired in 2009.\textsuperscript{196}

“In cities all across America, there are critical transportation and infrastructure issues that need to be addressed. I am optimistic that bipartisan conversations such as this one

\textsuperscript{193} Ibid.
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advance the public debate and pave the way for a transportation bill that provides long-
term certainty allowing cities and states to plan and execute transportation upgrades,”
said Mayor Reed. “I urge Congress to come together around a transportation act that
allows us to rebuild America and improve our nation’s transit centers, highways,
railways, airports and ports.”

Mayor Reed serves as chair of the U.S. Conference of Mayors’ Committee on
Transportation. Alongside him were 184 mayors who signed a bipartisan letter on March
5, 2012, to Congress urging them to pass pending “bicameral, bipartisan surface
transportation legislation” in order to “help us accelerate the financing of highway and
transit infrastructure, create well paying jobs and help get our economy back on track.”
The letter stated the following: “Next year, cities and their metro areas will generate 90.4
percent of our Gross Domestic Product and 85.6 percent of the nation’s jobs. Our local
areas are the engines of the U.S. economy, and investment in our future is an investment
in the nation’s future prosperity.”

The Mayors for Transportation Campaign was launched on March 27. The
campaign was formulated to further support for prompt congressional action to help
states and cities repair and modernize roads, bridges, and other key infrastructure critical
to economic recovery and growth.

A survey was administered and Mayor Kasim Reed, USCM Transportation
Committee Chair, delivered the survey findings. With the economic problems facing the
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nation, the mayors believe it is more important than ever that federal transportation priorities be targeted to metropolitan areas. Two-thirds of U.S. residents live in metropolitan areas. "As the federal government sets priorities for long-term spending and deficit reduction, future transportation infrastructure investments should focus spending on pressing metropolitan transportation infrastructure needs as opposed to low-priority highway expansion projects such as the infamous Bridge to Nowhere," said Reed. He went further to say, "The long-term productivity of transportation infrastructure spending is greater when it is invested where economic growth will occur, which is in the metropolitan areas."

Major findings of the United States Conference of Mayors Metropolitan Transportation Infrastructure survey include:

- Ninety-eight percent of the mayors point to investment in affordable, reliable transportation as an important part of their cities' economic recovery and growth.
- Ninety-three percent of the mayors urge reforms in federal transportation programs to allow cities and their metropolitan areas to receive a greater share of federal funds directly.
- Absent a greater share of funding directly to cities and metropolitan areas, only seven percent of the mayors indicate support to increase the federal gas tax.
- Ninety-six percent of the mayors believe that the federal government should increase spending on transportation infrastructure to reverse decades of

---

underinvestment in cities, with strong majorities indicating support to increase the federal gas tax to improve transportation infrastructure, if a greater share of the funding were invested in local road and bridge infrastructure (89%), and public transit (65%).

• Seventy-five percent of the mayors indicate support to increase the federal gas tax if a greater share of the funding were invested in bicycle and pedestrian projects.

• Eighty percent of the mayors indicate that highway expansion should be a low priority.

• Seventy-five percent of the mayors say a national infrastructure bank or expanded availability of federal financing tools such as Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) or Build America Bonds would accelerate or increase the number of transportation projects that could be implemented.201

Statistics show that in the United States, metropolitan areas account for 86 percent of employment, 90 percent of wage income, and over the next 20 years, 94 percent of the nation’s economic growth. These metropolitan areas are still facing the nation’s worst traffic jams, its oldest roads and bridges, and transit systems at capacity. These areas are receiving significantly less in federal transportation investments considering their importance to the nation’s economy.202

Tom Coehran, USCM CEO and Executive Director underscored this point. “The largest metropolitan areas account for 87 percent of the nation’s traffic. The three most congested areas – Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago – account for 27 percent of that traffic. Our metropolitan areas rank high among world economies, but they are saddled with..."
with bus and rail systems at capacity and aging roads and bridges that will undermine their ability to meet the nation’s future economic output. Given these factors, metropolitan areas should be at the center of federal transportation infrastructure investment. They are the drivers of the 21st century United States economy.” Cochran continues by saying, “This survey confirms what mayors have been saying for years: through a new direct partnership with mayors, the federal government should make tomorrow’s transportation infrastructure more metropolitan-focused, more energy-efficient, and more environmentally sustainable.”

The United States Conference of Mayors are working in collaboration with the Obama Administration and Congress in helping to shape a federal surface transportation law that will rebuild transportation infrastructure in metropolitan areas, reduce traffic congestion, create jobs, and ensure that cities and their metropolitan economies across the United States, and, in turn, the nation’s economy, emerge from the recession. The President and CEO of Parsons Brinkerhoff, which sponsored the survey, spoke to the global benefit of increased infrastructure investments in this country. “While the United States has been disinvesting in transportation infrastructure, we see other countries taking a cue from our history by making significant investments in transportation,” said Parsons Brinckerhoff President and CEO George J. Pierson.

“Today, we are investing approximately two percent of our GDP on infrastructure; Europe and China are investing approximately five percent and nine percent, respectively. Growth in India, China, Brazil and other surging economies is being fueled in part by investment in transit systems, roads, airports and other infrastructure. Thousands of miles of high-speed rail systems are being built in Europe and Asia, connecting population and economic centers. When mayors in the United States speak to their need to improve the quality of roads and transit systems in their cities, they are responding to a public need in a way that will arm their cities for success in global

---
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competition," concluded Pierson.205

Mayor Kasim Reed used the platform of the Kiwanis Club of Atlanta to urge support for the penny sales tax for regional transportation that supposed to go before voters in July. Immediately following lunch at the Kiwanis Club of Atlanta, Reed was going to the Atlanta City Council meeting where the issue of airport concessions was to be debated. He welcomed the opportunity to talk about something else other than the city’s process of selecting new food, beverage and retail business for Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport. “I’m going to have a pretty tough time at City Council today,” Reed said. “You are the highlight of my day. I’m not making it up when I say I’m glad to be here.”206

The mayor said that the future of Atlanta, the state and the nation is building infrastructure, particularly with transportation. “If you don’t have (infrastructure), you are going to be left behind,” Reed said, later adding that the T-Splostd (the regional transportation sales tax referendum) was an example. “We need to pass it.” Reed said the penny sales tax would generate about $700 million a year for 10 years, and those dollars would be invested in metro Atlanta’s transportation networks — including transit and roads. “I believe this is fundamental to us maintaining our position as a leading city in the South,” Reed said.207

Reed was later asked about his long-term goals for the city, he said: “the future is
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infrastructure investment." As mayor, Reed said he is part of "almost every major recruitment effort in our region." Metropolitan Atlanta's congestion seems to be the biggest criticism that he hears from companies considering investing. "That's the reason we are losing some of the close projects," Reed said. He was also addressed with the question of the HOT lanes on I-85 and the aborted project to add HOT lanes along I-75 could hurt the chances of getting the referendum passed. "I think it's going to hurt us," Reed said, adding that all the big initiatives in Atlanta — such as MARTA — were close votes. "This is a decision about whether we want to move forward or whether we want to be small."208

ATLANTA CITY COUNCIL ON TRANSPORTATION

Mayor Kasim Reed met with the Atlanta City Council to ask members to become knowledgeable about a referendum slated for 2012. This referendum would allow the region's residents to tax themselves for transportation improvements. Reed said he was invited to the chamber to talk about House Bill 277, which passed earlier this year to set up the referendum. He argued that its passage would be an economic stimulus for the city. As a result, the city has lost as many as 88,000 jobs and is struggling to find work for the middle class. "It's our own economic stimulus," Reed said.209

The referendum is projected to create a $500 million revenue in infrastructure investment over 10 years, according to a financial analysis the mayor has had conducted. When asked by Councilman C.T. Martin when the analysis would be released, Mayor
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Reed said on the upcoming Wednesday. The members of the council were in the progress of planning a town hall meeting to discuss the bill's effect on MARTA. Reed, who was not initially at the council work session, made a surprise visit after the council started criticizing the process to mayoral staff making the initial presentation. Several members wanted to know more about a provision in the legislation that would not allow MARTA's current system to receive operations funding from the tax. MARTA was the only one of the state's many taxpayer-funded transit systems being restricted. Mayor Reed is a big supporter of the referendum and still seeks to the council's support because he feels it will be a tough sell.

"The vote for the referendum on HB 277 is going to be a close vote," he said. "So how members of council feel matters." Martin thanked the mayor for his input, saying, "You make the point that we have to get involved in the political process." Martin feels that the mayor and the council are moving towards on accord. Martin remained somewhat skeptical of the measure from the legislature and the governor's office, taking into consideration Georgia's new leader in January.

Mayor Kasim Reed presented 20 transportation projects and city council members resisted. They felt the list did not address key issues for the city and they had no input. This created more friction, because Reed was expected to decrease the 20 projects. These
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projects would cost an estimated $6.9 billion obtained from 2012 referendum tax money set aside for transportation needs. They wanted a more feasible number by Wednesday to submit to the state.213

"Whoever had the bright idea to circumvent the council may have doomed the council’s support for this; it is just a matter of good form that you would want to have the buy-in of the council," council president Ceasar C. Mitchell said. "The political risk here is members of the council being more aloof on this project. There has to be a strong push to get people to vote on this. This doesn’t help me in wanting to support this."214

The mayor explained that he was on a time crunch, adhering to a recently established timeline. He also stated that there had been turnover in his office. "I was not briefed on this until Friday," Reed said. "You should not feel disrespected." Among the items under consideration on Reed’s list are: $920 million to repair roads, bridges and sidewalks throughout the city, $1.9 billion to create at least three light rail lines and $740 million to build and improve bicycle and pedestrian access to existing and planned transit stations. Reed’s list also included more than $1 billion in capital investments to bring MARTA “into a state of good repair.”215

Council member C.T. Martin, who chairs the council’s transportation committee, said just one of the mayor’s 20 recommendations -- funding for roads and bridges -- directly benefits Atlanta. The others seemed to be regional, for example, $25 million to connect the Silver Comet Trail in Cobb County to Centennial Olympic Park. Councilwoman Felicia Moore feels that it is impossible for council members to have any
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kind of meaningful input in the city’s transportation future. “If we hadn’t called this meeting, we wouldn’t know anything,” Moore said. She feels that they would not have been aware of anything if Mayor Reed had not made the surprise visit. Councilman Michael Julian Bond acknowledged the fact that Sandy Springs and DeKalb County have full government participation and the continual council snubs are “almost getting to the point where it is beginning to be offensive.” “This is a huge problem to not have the city council involved earlier,” Bond said. “Get us involved in the beginning, because we’re on the hook for this thing, too.”

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is responsible for determining the region’s transportation needs and providing a framework to address anticipated growth through systems and policies. The RTP will then provide a comprehensive statement of the regional future transportation needs as identified, containing strategies aimed at improving mobility and access, and defining both short- and long-term transportation strategies and investments to improve the region’s transportation system. These factors will be identifiable by local jurisdictions, the State and other stakeholders. Federal funds are allocated by the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for use in construction of the highest-priority transportation projects in the near term of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The TIP has to be financially balanced and in line with the
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long-range objectives of the RTP.217

COMMUTE OPTIONS

"Commute Options are intended to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution by eliminating single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips and/or decreasing the length of those SOV trips. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) encompasses a set of strategies to increase the use of commute options. The Atlanta Regional Commission's (ARC) TDM Division, now known as RideSmart, serves as the focal point for providing TDM services to the Atlanta region. The TDM Division manages RideSmart services, including the regional Guaranteed Ride Home and SchoolPool program, and provides technical and financial management for Employer Service Organizations (ESOs) who work with area employers to help establish and operate commute options programs for their employees."218

Individual commute options include:

• Carpooling
• Vanpooling
• Transit
• Biking and Walking
• Teleworking
• Flexible work schedules219

INTELLEGENGT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

"Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) include the application and integration of advanced technologies, information processing, communications technologies and advanced control strategies for the efficient and effective operation of the existing
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transportation system. Examples of ITS include:

- Roadway management - signal synchronization, cameras, and variable message signs
- Incident management - HEROs
- Emergency management - signal preemption
- Transit management - transit signal priority
- Traveler information - *DOT and 511
- Systems management and operations

REGIONAL TRANSIT PLANNING AND COORDINATION

“Anchored by MARTA and served by three additional providers, the regional transit system offers commuters travel options. As part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), transit plays a major role in alleviating congestion and improving air quality, while supporting the land use and development goals and policies of the Regional Agenda. The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), working with regional partners and service providers, reviews, analyzes and incorporates transit projects into its planning process.”

PLAN 2040 is the region’s current RTP. It includes several different types of transit projects and covers a range of transit modes that combine to create a seamless transit system. This system will allow commuters to connect easily to numerous destinations. Transit serves the purpose of reducing the number of single-occupant vehicles (SOV). Its ultimate objective is to provide additional travel options to regional...

---


citizens. By providing numerous alternatives to the SOV, the regional transportation system will become more efficient and comprehensive.223

In reflection of the Regional Transit Institutional Analysis Study, a partnership was formed consisting of local governments, state agencies and current transit providers. They came together to discuss the establishment of a seamless, integrated transit system in the Atlanta region.224 The Transit Planning Board (TPB), was created to focus on the following:

- Ensure the development of a regional transit plan;
- Improve regional system coordination;
- Carry out system performance measurement; and
- Serve as an advocate for increased federal funding for the regional transit system.225

The Regional Transit Committee was established in January 2010 and is currently guiding the implementation of Concept 3, the long-range transit vision for the Atlanta region developed by the board's predecessors, the Transit Planning Board (TPB) and the Transit Implementation Board.226

TRANSIT PLANNING
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“Concept 3 is the Atlanta region’s official long-range transit vision. It was developed through a collaborative, multi-year effort led by the Transit Planning Board, a predecessor to today’s Regional Transit Committee (RTC). The vision was officially adopted in 2008 and now serves as the transit element of the Aspirations Plan of the Regional Transportation Plan.”227

HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION

“Human Services Transportation (HST) includes a broad range of service options designed to meet the needs of the region’s transportation disadvantaged, including persons with disabilities, individuals with lower incomes and older adults. These individuals have different needs and require a variety of transportation services to ensure quality of life. Planning and Coordinating HST helps to improve the efficiency of limited transportation resources, reduce duplication of services, and improve customer satisfaction. On April 21, 2010, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) adopted the 2010-Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan, which provides a framework for the Atlanta region to improve mobility for the disabled, low income and older adult populations. There are three Federal Transit Administration (FTA) HST Programs: The Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program, Section 5317 New Freedom program, and Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities program. ARC and MARTA administer the JARC and New Freedom programs for the Atlanta region while the Department of Human Services administers the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities program for the state of Georgia. The goals and objectives for the above programs are documented in the region’s Coordinated HST Plan.”228

ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM

“The goal of the Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities program is to improve mobility for older adults and persons with disabilities. The Section 5310 program provides funds for capital costs associated with providing transportation services to older adults and persons with disabilities, including vehicle purchases for nonprofit organizations and public entities in urbanized, small urban and rural areas. Funds for this program are apportioned to states on a formula basis depending upon the state’s elderly and disabled populations. In the state of Georgia, the Georgia Department of Human
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Services (DHS) is the designated recipient for Section 5310 funds. The DHS publishes an annual Georgia State Management Plan and Application Package for the Transportation of Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities program. This plan describes DHS’s role as the Designated Recipient and establishes the policies and procedures for administering the program and the competitive selection process for selecting projects. Currently this process is incorporated into the Atlanta region’s coordinated plan by reference only.”229

FTA JARC AND NEW FREEDOM PROGRAMS HST PROGRAMS

“The goal of the JARC program is to improve access to transportation services to and from employment and employment-related activities for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals. JARC also aims to transport residents of urbanized areas and nonurbanized areas to suburban employment opportunities. JARC funds are apportioned to states on a formula basis depending upon a state’s low-income population. JARC funds can be used for capital, planning and operating expenses with a 50/50 match requirement for operating and 80/20 match for capital.”230

SECTION 5317: NEW FREEDOM PROGRAM

“The New Freedom program aims to provide additional tools to overcome existing barriers facing Americans with disabilities who desire integration into the work force and full participation in society. New Freedom also seeks to reduce barriers to transportation services and expand the transportation mobility options available to people with disabilities beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. New Freedom funds are apportioned on a formula basis depending upon a state’s disability and elderly population. New Freedom funds can be used for both capital and operating expenses that support new public transportation services and/or alternatives that go beyond ADA requirements. The match requirements for New Freedom funds are 50/50 for operation and 80/20 for capital expenses.”231

FUNDED PROJECTS

“ARC and the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) are joint designated recipients of the Section 5316 JARC and Section 5317 New Freedom program
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funds for the Atlanta Urbanized Area. As joint designated recipients, ARC and MARTA are responsible for conducting the competitive selection process for JARC and New Freedom projects in the 18-county region. However, since MARTA also competes for these same funds, ARC is responsible for conducting the entire competitive selection process. Annually ARC conducts a “call for projects” to be funded through the JARC program.”

FINANCING TRANSPORTATION

“As the federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) of the Atlanta Region, ARC selects projects of significant regional benefit to be funded by a portion of the Federal transportation funds that are authorized for the Region. Additionally ARC ensures that the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) remains fiscally constrained per Federal guidelines—meaning that the total costs of all projects to be completed within the 30-year time horizon never exceed the anticipated levels of available funding. An estimated $1.5-$2 billion annually—depending on economic and fiscal conditions—is spent on transportation in the Atlanta Region. Funding for transportation in the Region is derived from various sources on the federal, state, regional, and local levels.”

FEDERAL FUNDING

“An estimated $600 million to $800 million of transportation funding in the Region—comprising an average 35 percent of all transportation funding in the Region—is derived from the Federal government. Federal funding for transportation is authorized through a transportation bill which sets upper limits on funding by categories for both highways and transit facilities. Revenues to support Federal spending on transportation stem from the Highway Trust Fund—which is supported by a national fuel tax (18.4 cents per gallon on gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon on diesel fuel).”

The Highway Trust Fund is comprised of two accounts:

• Highway Account (administered by FHWA)
• Mass Transit Account (administered by FTA)

232 Ibid.

233 Atlanta Regional Commission, “Financing Transportation”,
234 Ibid.
The highway account is the larger of the two accounts with a monetary value of roughly 71% of the total Highway Trust Fund value.\textsuperscript{235}

**THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) OF 1969**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their proposed actions on the human environment. NEPA is responsible for the basic national charter for protection of the environment, establishing the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and providing information and documents for the decision-making process. Furthermore, NEPA does not dictate what decision should be made.\textsuperscript{236} The Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) of 1991 provides for the disclosure of the environmental effects of proposed state projects. After the passing of GEPA, the General Assembly found that:

- The protection and preservation of Georgia's diverse environment is necessary for the maintenance of the public health and welfare and the continued viability of the economy of the state and is a matter of the highest public priority;
- State agencies should conduct their affairs with an awareness that they are stewards of the air, land, water, plants, animals, and environmental, historical, and cultural resources;
- Environmental evaluation should be a part of the decision-making processes of


\textsuperscript{236} Georgia Department of Transportation, "Frequently Asked Questions", [http://www.dot.state.ga.us/informationcenter/programs/environment/NEPA/Pages/FAQ.aspx](http://www.dot.state.ga.us/informationcenter/programs/environment/NEPA/Pages/FAQ.aspx), (accessed May 9, 2011).
the state; and

- Environmental effects reports can facilitate the fullest practicable provision of the timely public information, understanding, and participation in the decision-making process of the state.²³⁷

Public Involvement (PI) is very important in the decision making process for planning. The Department is responsible for reaching the public and being responsive to their concerns during project development. The NEPA section of Office of Environmental Services takes the lead on public involvement. Involvement is not limited to just the public, but all offices and employees are welcome to become involved as well. The Office of Environmental Services coordinates with federal, state and local agencies, local officials, and interested stakeholders. The Department personnel are responsible for holding outreach meetings involving individuals, neighborhoods, business groups, special interest groups, citizen advisory committees and Environmental Justice communities.²³⁸

The Public Information Open House (PIOH) may be held at any time during project development, to gather input on multiple project alternatives early in development, to present the public with the projects detour requirements during construction, or to describe the project’s potential impact to community resources.²³⁹ A

---


Public Hearing Open House (PHOH) is required by NEPA for all projects requiring an EA or an EIS. They are held following FHWA’s approval of the draft environmental document, and required by Georgia state law to be advertised twice: once no less than 30 days prior to the meeting, and again no more than 5 days prior to the meeting. Everyone in attendance will receive a handout consisting of the purpose and need statement, the project description, a location map, a right-of-way summary, and an environmental impact summary.\textsuperscript{240}

President George W. Bush signed into law PL 105-178 on June 9, 1998. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorized highway, highway safety, transit and other surface transportation programs for the next 6 years. The two acts combined are referred to as TEA-21. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) was the last major authorizing legislation for surface transportation. TEA-21 builds on the initiatives of ISTEA and other program initiatives.\textsuperscript{241}

Significant features of TEA-21 include:

1. Assurance of a guaranteed level of Federal funds for surface transportation through FY 2003. The annual floor for highway funding is keyed to receipts of the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund (HTF). Transit funding is guaranteed at a selected fixed amount. All highway user taxes are extended at the same rates when the legislation was enacted.

\textsuperscript{239} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{241} "TEA-21 - Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Moving Americans into the 21st Century: A Summary- An Overview " \url{http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tea21/sumover.htm}
2. Extension of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) program, providing a flexible national 10 percent goal for the participation of disadvantaged business enterprises, including small firms owned and controlled by women and minorities, in highway and transit contracting undertaken with Federal funding.

3. Strengthening of safety programs across the Department of Transportation (DOT). New incentive programs, with great potential for savings to life and property, are aimed at increasing the use of safety belts and promoting the enactment and enforcement of 0.08 percent blood alcohol concentration standards for drunk driving. These new incentive funds also offer added flexibility to States since the grants can be used for any Title 23 U.S.C. activity.

4. Continuation of the proven and effective program structure established for highways and transit under the landmark ISTEA legislation. Flexibility in the use of funds, emphasis on measures to improve the environment, focus on a strong planning process as the foundation of good transportation decisions—all ISTEA hallmarks—are continued and enhanced by TEA-21. New programs such as Border Infrastructure, Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation, and Access to Jobs target special areas of national interest and concern.

5. Investing in research and its application to maximize the performance of the transportation system. Special emphasis is placed on deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems to help improve operations and management of transportation systems and vehicle safety.\(^{242}\)

---

\(^{242}\) Ibid.
According to Stephen Schmidt's article, "Incentive Effects of Expanding Federal Mass Transit Formula Grants," The TEA-21 requires medium cities with a population of 200,000-1,000,000 to produce transit output of 6-8 percent, and large cities with a population of 1,000,000 and greater to produce transit output of less than 2 percent.243

The federal government should subsidize mass transit. Section 9 of the Federal Public Transportation Act of 1982 established the formula for allocating federal transit subsidies. The way firms alter their decisions about output in response to subsidies are linked to the total output. The federal mass transit operating subsidy program offers firms a strong incentive to increase the amount of bus transit they provide.244

According to Bruce Katz's article, The Federal Role in Curbing Sprawl, "The federal government should extend the level of metropolitan administration that has been a part of federal transportation law since 1991. There are various metropolitan areas that only allow their bus routes to reach the borders of the central city."245 For example, MARTA extends its services through lines such as Cobb County Transit (CCT), Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA), and Clayton County's C-TRAN, which is now out of operation. Katz states that the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority is the only metropolitan transit system that receives no funding from its state government. Katz suggests that transportation resources be reallocated to serve two purposes. First it will weed the subsidy out of sprawl and compel exurban retail, commercial, and residential projects to stand on their own. Secondly, it will also enable the financing of


244 Ibid.
major infrastructure repair projects in cities and older suburbs that have been neglected for decades. Katz recommends that the federal government require the integration of metropolitan transit systems as a condition of receiving federal funds.246

According to Katz, the federal transportation funds should be used in metropolitan areas almost exclusively for the repair and maintenance of existing highways and for the expansion of alternative transportation strategies that relieve congestion and promote more balanced growth patterns. MARTA is the only metropolitan transit system that receives no funding from its state government.247

MARTA ADMINISTRATION, REGULATION, AND FUNDING

The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority is the ninth largest transit system in the U.S. that provides bus, rail and paratransit service and the largest public transit system in the southern U.S.248 MARTA’s administration consists of two teams, The Executive Management Team and the Board of Directors, presently lead MARTA. The Executive Management Team consists of Beverly A. Scott, Ph.D., General Manager/Chief Executive Officer, Dwight A. Ferrell, Deputy General Manager/Chief Operations Officer, and Ted Basta, Chief of Business Support Services. The Executive Management Team is responsible for operations, maintenance, finance, and human resources. Of the 3 members of the Executive Management team, 2 are black.

246 Ibid.


Board of Directors is made up of 12 members from the City of Atlanta, Fulton County, DeKalb County, the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, and the Georgia Department of Transportation. Out of the 12 members, two of them represent the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, and the Georgia Department of Transportation.\textsuperscript{249} Eleven are voting members and one is a non-voting member. The voting members include representatives from the City of Atlanta and Fulton and DeKalb Counties as well as the Georgia Department of Transportation commissioner. The executive director of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority is a non-voting member.\textsuperscript{250}

Dr. Scott has served in the transportation industry for more than 30 years. In 2009, Dr. Scott served as the Chairperson of the American Public Transportation Association (APTA), a national organization with a total organizational membership of more than 1,500 groups and businesses. After serving as General Manager/Chief Executive Officer of the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Dr. Scott joined the MARTA Team. Prior to that, she served as the General Manager of the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority, one of only four statewide public transit systems in the United States.\textsuperscript{251} Dr Beverly A. Scott is not only the first female General Manager/Chief Executive Officer of MARTA,


she is also the first black to serve in this position. Like MARTA, the City of Atlanta is also under the leadership of an African American, Mayor Kasim Reed. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, blacks make up approximately 54.0% of the city of Atlanta (over half the city).252 The large percentage of blacks in the city of Atlanta contributes to the large number of black ridership on MARTA.

The MARTA Board of Directors duties are to meet regularly to address the latest issues of importance concerning ridership, safety, economics, new technology, government regulations and more. The Board of Directors has four standing committees: Operations & Safety Committee, Audit Committee, Planning & External Relations Committee, and Business Management Committee.253 MARTA is funded by a one-cent sales tax collected in City of Atlanta, Fulton and DeKalb Counties with a FY 2011 operating budget of $389.64 million. The FY 2011 total capital budget is $320.8 million, which includes $132.8 million allocated for debt service.254


CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order for this research to be successful, I collected scholarly journal articles, newspaper articles, previous research done on the subject matter, read blogs, and conducted surveys. This information gathered for this research was made accessible through public libraries, the world wide web (www), electronic documents (past research done on subject matter), and public transit riders. The information gathered for this research includes existing analyses, studies, and quantitative and qualitative data. The information gathering technique included the distribution and collection of surveys. The information gathering technique did not include personal observations.

The following methods were used to collect my data: surveys and scholarly works on transportation equity in Atlanta, Georgia. The scholarly journal articles and previous research on the topic both served as a secondary source of data collection. My intent was to look for past and present solutions used by MARTA and various other public transit systems here in the Atlanta Metropolitan area. I also wanted to do a comparative analysis of BART in California and Boston Massachusetts Public Transit System. The statistical procedures performed after the collecting the surveys were done through the use of SPSS. The SPSS software will do the following:

- Quickly prepare data in just a single step with Automated Data Preparation;
- View significance tests in the main results table;
- Fast performance on procedures for Frequencies, Descriptives and Crosstabs;
- Manage and analyze datasets;
- Create customized, user-defined interfaces for existing procedures and user-
defined procedures; and

- Multithreaded procedures that improve performance and scalability.\(^{255}\)

The statistical procedures performed consist of entering the survey results into an Excel file, then uploading the file as an SPSS document. After the file was uploaded, I then began coding it so that all of the responses reflected numeric values, creating frequency tables and correlation tables. Frequency is the number of items, or cases, falling into a category or classification.\(^{256}\) Correlation denotes the relationship between two or more quantitative variables. It is sometimes loosely used to denote statistical association, even when the variables are qualitative.\(^{257}\)

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There is one theory of significance to this study: The Regime Theory. According to Gerry Stoker, regime theory holds substantial promise for understanding the variety of responses to urban change. Its emphasis on the interdependence of governmental and non-governmental forces in meeting economic and social challenges focuses attention upon the problem of cooperation and coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors.\(^{258}\) The Victoria Transport Policy Institute’s research on Evaluating Transportation Equity states that “equity” (also called justice and fairness) refers to the


distribution of impacts (benefits and costs) and whether that distribution is considered appropriate.\textsuperscript{259} Transport planning decisions have significant and diverse equity impact:

- The quality of transportation available affects opportunities and quality of life (for those who use public transportation).
- Public transport planning decisions affect the location and type of development that occurs in an area, and therefore accessibility, land values and developer profits.
- Public transport facilities, activities and services impose various indirect and external costs, such as congestion delay and accident risk imposed on other road users, infrastructure costs not funded through user fees, pollution, and undesirable land use impacts.
- Public transport expenditures represent a major share of most household, business and government expenditures. Price structures can significantly affect financial burdens.
- Public transport facilities require significant amounts of land that is generally exempt from rent and taxes, representing an additional but hidden subsidy of transport activity.
- Public transport planning decisions can stimulate employment and economic development, which have distributional impacts.\textsuperscript{260}

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FRAMEWORK

Environmental Justice is a priority of both the White House and at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Environmental Justice framework (EJF) is


\textsuperscript{260} Ibid.
a building block for equal access to the fundamental rights that all people are entitled to. Everyone has the right to live, work, learn, pray and play in a healthy and sustainable environment. The five characteristics consist of a “framework” or plan to help stop the unfair targeting of African-American communities, the poor, disadvantaged populations, marginalized groups, and other minority communities. Accordingly, these characteristics state:

1.) *The environmental justice framework incorporates the principle of the "right of all individuals to be protected from environmental degradation."* The fare increase and elimination of bus lines does not necessarily seek to avoid protection of all populations from harm. However, no one population was considered in the decision making process.

2.) *The environmental justice framework adopts a public health model of prevention (elimination of the threat before harm occurs) as the preferred strategy.* The environmental justice framework shifts the burden of proof to polluters/dischargers who do harm, discriminate, or who do not give equal protection to racial and ethnic minorities, and other "protected" classes.

Unreliable public transit results in inadequate access to healthcare. This affects morbidity and mortality. Unreliable public transit prevents access to

---


263 Ibid.

264 Ibid.
doctor's offices for treatment to prevent and/or treat any health disparities. If a patient cannot access proper healthcare, there is no way possible he/she can be treated.

3.) The environmental justice framework shifts the burden of proof to polluters/dischargers who do harm, discriminate, or who do not give equal protection to racial and ethnic minorities, and other "protected" classes. 265

The recent changes MARTA has made directly impact minority communities and people of color the most. A large percentage of MARTA’s fare payers are minorities and people of color.

4.) The environmental justice framework would allow disparate impact and statistical weight, as opposed to "intent," to infer discrimination. 266 "Jobs out of reach, missed health appointments, no access to childcare, inability to attend night classes; these problems stem from the same root; decades of transportation decisions made without adequately involving low-income families who use transit." 267

5.) The environmental justice framework redresses disproportionate impact through "targeted" action and resources. 268 This strategy would occur in low-income communities that are greatly affected by the fare increases and bus

265 Ibid.

266 Ibid.


line terminations. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, to ensure full participation of the disadvantage populations, people of color, Native Americans, and the poor in the decision-making process of transportation planning, it is imperative that the following Public Involvement tools are incorporated and implemented into transportation public outreach. They are as follows: Vision Planning Process, Surveys, Community Task Forces, Visual Preference Surveys, Neighborhood or Community Advisory Groups, Publications, Newsletters and Flyers, Meetings, Telephone Hot Lines, Storefront Information Centers, Use of Local Community Advisory Committee, Focus Group Task Forces, Evaluations of Public Involvement Plans, Meeting Sign-in Sheets, Telephone Contacts, Local Groups and Institutions, Internet (if access is widely available), and Speaking at Other People’s Meetings and Events.\textsuperscript{269} It is good to educate the low-income families of their rights, before presenting the issues to the MARTA Board.

\begin{center}
\textbf{CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION}
\end{center}

The central research question is “What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not

increase fares?” Hypothesis: By charging Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties service charges, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority would more likely maintain services and not increase fares.

In addition to the central research question, other questions will be developed to help guide the study.

1. How should the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) be funded?
2. Who regulates the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)?
3. How should the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) be regulated after receiving funding?
4. What financial responsibilities does Fulton and DeKalb counties have to the funding of MARTA?
5. What is the problem with transportation equity and planning in Atlanta?
6. Which minority groups does it affect or impact?
7. How does MARTA compare with other public transportation sources such as Clayton County Public Transit (C-Tran), Cobb County Transit, and Gwinnett County Transit?
8. What is Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority financial structure for funding?

This research has been narrowed down to the central question of “What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?” An investigation into this question will help clarify the reasons why MARTA continues to raise fares, cut bus lines, and restrict services.

Research Question:
1. What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?

DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE

The data collection methods included survey research and secondary literature. According to Johnson and Reynolds, survey research is the gathering of information about the characteristics, behavior, or attitudes of a relatively large group of people, often referred to as a “population”. The goal of survey research is to measure accurately people’s attitudes, beliefs, and behavior by asking them questions.\textsuperscript{270} The survey questions were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the collection of surveys lasted until the last survey was completed. I surveyed patrons of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority and the Latin American Association. Surveys of the same content were distributed at five of the following MARTA rail stations with bus bays: Five Points, Airport, Lindbergh Center, College Park, West End, Kensington, Peachtree Center, and Arts Center. These stations were identified by the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s Research Department.

The five MARTA rail stations with bus bays that were surveyed included Kensington Station, Lindbergh Center Station, College Park Station, West End Station, and Five Points Station. Before I could begin the survey research, I had to get approval from MARTA’s Communication Department. The process included contacting the Communication’s Department and setting up a meeting with them. After meeting with the Communications Department, I was asked to provide them with a formal letter of intent, a copy of the survey, the IRB approval letter, a waiver of liability, and the amount of time needed to complete the surveys.

\textsuperscript{270} Ibid p. 176.
I began my survey collection at Kensington Station on October 12, 2011. The entire process lasted approximately five and a half hours. A great percentage of my survey came from non-traditional students that attended Open Campus High School. They were really concerned with the price increase and some also expressed that if prices kept rising, they would not be able to afford their commute to school. The second location was Lindbergh Center Station on October 13, 2011. The survey collection process took approximately five hours and fifteen minutes. Most of the people I interviewed at this station were either going to work or coming from work.

On October 15, 2011, I attempted to collect surveys at the Airport station, but the foot traffic at the airport was swift and constant. Everyone I asked to complete the survey was either in route to work or to catch a flight. I decided to leave the Airport Station, after receiving a negative response. I traveled one stop North to the College Park Station, where I felt I would get a better response and participation. The survey collection at the College Park Station took approximately three hours and fifteen minutes.

The fourth station I surveyed was West End Station on October 24, 2011. The administration time was approximately two hours and twenty minutes. My expectations were to survey a large percentage of students at this station, because of its location near the Atlanta University Center (AUC). I only surveyed a few students. The final MARTA station was Five Points Station. The survey collection time took approximately two hours and fifteen minutes. During the collection of surveys at the five MARTA stations, the survey participants were very vocal. They wanted to discuss the fare increases and the line eliminations. Some of the participants were not aware of how MARTA is funded. They were under the impression that MARTA received
governmental funds.

My data collection also consisted in surveying the Latin American Association in Atlanta, Georgia. The process consisted of contacting the Communication Department and setting up a meeting with Ms. J. Tapia, the Communication Director for Latin American Association. I was asked to provide them with formal letter of intent, a copy of the survey, the IRB approval letter, a waiver of liability, and the amount of time needed to complete the surveys. It was imperative that I collected the responses from the Latin American community, because I previously surveyed the black and white populations.

The past literature related to this research was collected after reviewing various sources and selecting the scholarly writings relevant to my research topic. There is no special set of resources and/or support measures needed to facilitate the completion of this data collection. All the resources needed in conducting this research are made through survey research.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data collection methods included survey research and secondary literature. These methods are being used, because there are specified questions and present a hypothesis to be tested. After collecting the responses from the survey research, I entered the responses into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The SPSS software will do the following:

- Quickly prepare data in just a single step with Automated Data Preparation
- View significance tests in the main results table
- Fast performance on procedures for Frequencies, Descriptives and Crosstabs
• Manage and analyze datasets
• Create customized, user-defined interfaces for existing procedures and user-defined procedures
• Multithreaded procedures that improve performance and scalability

Secondary literature serves as a knowledge base for conducting the research project. It is essential in any research project to know a great deal about the subject matter. According to Johnson and Reynolds, "Good research involves reviewing what has been written. Among the many reasons for doing so are (1) to see what has and has not been investigated; (2) to develop general explanations for observed variations in a behavior or phenomenon; (3) to identify potential relationships between concepts and to identify researchable hypotheses; (4) to learn how others have defined and measure key concepts; (5) to identify data sources that other researchers have used; (6) to develop alternative research designs; and (7) to discover how a research project is related to the work of others."272

CASE STUDY

This case study is a comparative analysis between the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (South), Bay Area Rapid Transit (West), and Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (East). The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s Board of Directors is comprised of twelve members. All of the members represent three


metropolitan areas: City of Atlanta, Fulton County, and Dekalb County.\textsuperscript{273} The Bay Area Rapid Transit Authority’s Board of Directors is comprised of nine elected officials from the nine BART districts. The Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority’s board of directors is comprised of 5 members that were appointed by the Governor.\textsuperscript{274} All three of the Board of Directors serves as regimes for their respective transportation authorities. These regimes come together to work towards an ultimately goal, such as to address the latest issues of importance concerning ridership, safety, economics, new technology, government regulations and more.\textsuperscript{275} After comparing the three Board of Directors, I notice that the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s Board of Directors is not as diverse as the Bay Area Rapid Transit’s and Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority’s Board of Directors.

\begin{center}
\textbf{MARTA BUS SCHEDULE}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Weekdays & 5:00 am- 1:30 am \\
\hline
Weekends and Holidays & 5:00 am- 12:30 am \textsuperscript{276} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{274} Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, “About the MBTA: MassDOT Board of Directors”, \texttt{http://www.mbta.com/about_the_mbta/leadership/?id=1046}, (accessed February 13, 2012).


## MARTA RAIL STATIONS AND SCHEDULES

### RED LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekdays</strong></td>
<td>4:55 am- 2:10 am</td>
<td>4:51 am- 1:33 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday</strong></td>
<td>5:50 am- 1:49 am</td>
<td>6:31 am- 1:24 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday</strong></td>
<td>5:50 am- 1:49 am</td>
<td>6:31 am- 1:24 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holidays</strong></td>
<td>4:57 am- 2:06 am</td>
<td>11:27 am- 4:09 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOLD LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekdays</strong></td>
<td>4:45 am- 2:00 am</td>
<td>4:45 am- 1:53 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday</strong></td>
<td>6:00 am- 1:40 am</td>
<td>5:55 am- 1:55 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday</strong></td>
<td>6:00 am- 1:40 am</td>
<td>5:55 am- 1:55 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Holidays</strong></th>
<th>4:45 am - 1:55 am</th>
<th>4:45 am - 1:47 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BLUE LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Weekdays</strong></th>
<th><strong>East bound</strong></th>
<th><strong>West Bound</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:41 am - 1:55 am</td>
<td>4:49 am - 1:44 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6:01 am - 1:55 am</td>
<td>6:00 am - 1:44 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6:01 am - 1:55 am</td>
<td>6:00 am - 1:44 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>4:35 am - 1:50 am</td>
<td>4:45 am - 1:39 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Weekdays</strong></th>
<th><strong>East Bound</strong></th>
<th><strong>West Bound</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:58 am - 1:12 am</td>
<td>4:48 am - 1:01 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6:01 am - 1:05 am</td>
<td>5:59 am - 1:16 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6:01 am - 1:05 am</td>
<td>5:59 am - 1:16 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### MARTA BUSES AND TRAINS FARES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Card (With purchase of additional fare. All fare products must be loaded on a Breeze Card.)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Fair</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Trip</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Trips</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Trips</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day Pass (Unlimited rides, for 7 consecutive days beginning first-time used.)</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day Pass (Unlimited rides, valid for 30 consecutive days beginning first time used.)</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Day Visitor Pass (1-4 Days, Unlimited rides.)</td>
<td>$9.00 - $19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day Pass</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Day Pass</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Day Pass</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Day Pass</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Fare Children 46&quot; and under (maximum two per paying adult can ride free. Check at Breeze Vending Machines, faregates and entrances of bus doors to measure height of child.)</td>
<td>FREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visitor's Pass Program
Discount program for groups and convention visitors
Discounted Fare

### Partnership Program *
Corporate Discount Program for Employers
Discounted Fare

### University Pass (U-Pass) Program *
Monthly discount program for college or university students and staff
Students: $68.50, Faculty/Staff: $83.80

### Student Pass Program *
Weekly discount program for K-12 students in Fulton & DeKalb Counties
$14.40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced Fare Program *</th>
<th>$.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount program for seniors citizens, disabled riders and MediCare recipients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>Regular Fare Free with Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MARTA's schedules show that the earliest the bus will begin service on weekdays and weekends is 5:00 AM and the train will begin service on weekdays at 4:41 AM and 5:50 AM on weekends. The bus ends service on weekdays at 1:30 AM and weekends at 12:30 AM. The train ends services weekdays as late as 1:53 AM and weekends as late as 1:55 AM.

**BART SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>4:00 am- Midnight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6:00 am- Midnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8:00 am- Midnight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many cases, service extends past midnight.\textsuperscript{292}

The plan for BART was never intended to be a 24-hour system. When cost projections were initially developed, the residents of the region who voted to approve BART supported a system that would have limited hours of operation. In the beginning, BART was actually closed on weekends. Whoever, BART does extend service for special events, such as New Year's Eve celebrations and when large crowds are expected. There is approximately a four-hour window between when the last trains of the day leaves, and when the first trains of the day begin service. The four-hour window is usually used for nightly track maintenance. Some public transit systems operate with

multiple sets of tracks on the same routes. Unfortunately, BART does not have the multiple tracks that would allow them to run trains on one set while performing maintenance on another. BART has to shut down the third-rail power for maintenance crews to be able to operate safely.\textsuperscript{293}

\textbf{BART SUBWAY FARES}

| BART Blue High Value Ticket (A 6.25\% discount in two denominations.) | $48 ticket for $45; a $64 ticket for $60 |
| BART Green Ticket (A 62.5\% discount for seniors 65 years and older.) | $24 ticket for only $9 |
| BART Orange Ticket (A discount for middle and secondary school students; Students age 13 to 18 who are enrolled in middle or secondary school. The orange ticket may be used only for trips to and from school or school-sponsored events, Monday through Friday only.) | 50\% of full fare. Orange tickets with \$32 value are sold for $16. |
| BART Plus Ticket (A “flash pass” for other transit operators.) | 
| BART Red Ticket (A 62.5\% discount for persons with disabilities, Medicare cardholders and children 5-12 years old.) | $24 ticket for $9 |
| BART/Muni Adult “A” Fast Pass® (The $72 "A" Fast Pass®, available on the Clipper® card, is valid for a calendar month and lets you take unlimited rides on SFMTA/Muni vehicles and BART within San Francisco.) | $72 valid for a calendar month |
| BART/ Muni Senior & Disabled Fast Pass® Pilot Program (The BART/Muni Senior and Disabled Fast Pass® Pilot Program has been extended for 6 months, from August 1, 2011 through January 31, 2012, to offer a new and easier way for eligible individuals to purchase a Muni Senior and Disabled Fast Pass®, which is good for unlimited rides on Muni and BART within San Francisco. Each month, 1,000 Senior and Disabled Fast Passes® will be sold at various locations in San Francisco on a first-come, first-serve basis to eligible individuals.) | 
| Active duty military personnel on leave | FREE $50 BART ticket. |

* BART Tickets and Smart Cards BART fares are set with a mileage-based formula, therefore time-based passes (e.g., weekly or monthly) are not available. You can’t buy BART discount tickets from a vending machine at the station. BART discount tickets are only sold online, through the mail and at selected retail vendors throughout the Bay Area. Clipper Card; Clipper is a "smart card" that works on various Bay Area transit operators. It’s managed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. When using BART Green Tickets, seniors are required to carry proof of age. Adults using BART Red Tickets are required to carry an RTC Discount ID Card, or

a Medicare Card, a DMV Disabled Parking Pacard or license plate, or a discount card from another California transit operator, and picture ID.\textsuperscript{24}

**MBTA BUS SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Routes</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Bound</td>
<td>Out Bound</td>
<td>In Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route CT1</td>
<td>6:30 am-</td>
<td>6:00 am-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:40 am</td>
<td>7:13 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route CT2</td>
<td>6:35 am-</td>
<td>5:55 am-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:37 am</td>
<td>7:23 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route CT3</td>
<td>6:13 am-</td>
<td>6:05 am-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:33 pm</td>
<td>8:15 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 31</td>
<td>4:53 am-</td>
<td>4:38 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:56 am</td>
<td>1:21 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 34</td>
<td>4:45 am-</td>
<td>4:35 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:45 am</td>
<td>1:29 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 36</td>
<td>4:55 am-</td>
<td>4:37 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:06 am</td>
<td>1:22 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 44</td>
<td>5:10 am-</td>
<td>5:29 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:55 am</td>
<td>1:14 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 45</td>
<td>5:15 am-</td>
<td>5:34 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:01 am</td>
<td>1:15 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 57</td>
<td>4:33 am-</td>
<td>5:16 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:52 am</td>
<td>1:20 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 64</td>
<td>5:31 am-</td>
<td>6:00 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:57 am</td>
<td>1:11 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 68</td>
<td>6:35 am-</td>
<td>6:50 am-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:37 pm</td>
<td>6:53 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 69</td>
<td>5:25 am-</td>
<td>5:40 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 am</td>
<td>1:13 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 71</td>
<td>5:13 am-</td>
<td>4:51 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:31 am</td>
<td>1:19 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 73</td>
<td>5:02 am-</td>
<td>4:49 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:32 am</td>
<td>1:20 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 83</td>
<td>5:10 am-</td>
<td>5:30 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:51 am</td>
<td>1:24 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 85</td>
<td>5:45 am-</td>
<td>6:00 am-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:31 pm</td>
<td>7:53 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 87</td>
<td>5:10 am-</td>
<td>5:30 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:35 am</td>
<td>1:16 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 88</td>
<td>5:16 am-</td>
<td>5:35 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:53 am</td>
<td>1:19 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 90</td>
<td>6:30 am-</td>
<td>7:10 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:06 pm</td>
<td>10:41 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 92</td>
<td>5:00 am-</td>
<td>6:01 am-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:16 pm</td>
<td>9:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Route 93 | 4:49 am-1:22 am | 5:03 am-1:34 am | 4:47 am-1:20 am | 5:04 am-1:37 am | 5:29 am-12:10 am | 5:44 am-12:26 am |
| Route 99 | 6:00 am-12:51 am | 6:30 am-1:26 am | 6:30 am-12:52 am | 7:00 am-1:25 am | 8:30 am-12:52 am | 9:00 am-12:25 am |
| Route 104 | 5:11 am-12:59 am | 5:30 am-12:37 am | 5:00 am-12:53 am | 4:41 am-12:35 am | 6:35 am-12:56 am | 61:5 am-12:36 am |
| Route 106 | 5:00 am-12:22 am | 5:25 am-1:17 am | 5:00 am-1:09 am | 5:25 am-1:21 am | 6:57 am-1:11 am | 6:30 am-1:21 am |
| Route 109 | 5:00 am-12:20 am | 5:20 am-1:24 am | 5:20 am-12:25 am | 4:55 am-1:14 am | 5:45 am-12:22 am | 6:45 am-1:19 am |
| Route 110 | 5:00 am-12:56 am | 5:25 am-1:12 am | 5:20 am-12:53 am | 5:30 am-1:13 am | 6:15 am-10:50 pm | 6:35 am-10:27 pm |
| Route 111 | 4:49 am-1:01 am | 5:13 am-1:25 am | 5:00 am-12:53 am | 5:25 am-1:15 am | 5:35 am-12:44 am | 5:59 am-1:16 am |
| Route 134 | 5:50 am-12:24 am | 5:20 am-1:11 am | 6:15 am-1:20 am | 6:15 am-1:20 am | 6:21 am-12:08 pm | 6:05 am-12:25 am |
| Route 136 | 5:30 am-9:30 pm | 6:00 am-10:30 pm | 6:00 am-8:50 pm | 8:00 am-5:38 pm | 8:45 am-4:57 pm |
| Route 502 | 6:45 am-10:35 am | 7:01 am-10:01 pm | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Route 504 | 6:45 am-10:47 pm | 6:25 am-10:01 pm | 7:30 am-7:36 pm | 8:00 am-8:11 pm | NA | NA |

**MBTA TRAIN SCHEDULE:**

**BLUE LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:13 am-12:45 am</td>
<td>5:13 am-12:45 am</td>
<td>5:58 am-12:49 am(^{295})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:56 am-12:52 am</td>
<td>4:45 am-12:50 am</td>
<td>5:25 am-12:48 am(^{296})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORANGE LINE**

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td>5:16 am - 12:35 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>5:16 am - 12:35 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6:00 am - 12:35 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RED LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td>5:05 am - 1:05 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>5:05 am - 1:05 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>5:51 am - 1:05 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SILVER LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td>5:15 am - 1:02 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>5:19 am - 1:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>5:50 am - 1:00 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MBTA BUS FARES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Local Bus Pass</th>
<th>$40/Month (Unlimited travel of Local Bus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Inner Express Pass</td>
<td>$89/Month (Unlimited travel on Inner Express Bus PLUS Subway, Local Bus, Inner Harbor Ferry, and Commuter Rail Zone 1A).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Outer Express Pass</td>
<td>$129/month</td>
<td>(Unlimited travel on Outer Express Bus PLUS Inner Express Bus, Local Bus, Subway, Inner Harbor Ferry, and Commuter Rail Zone 1A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly LinkPass</td>
<td>$59/month</td>
<td>(Unlimited travel on Subway PLUS Local Bus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/Week LinkPass</td>
<td>$9.00 for 1 day</td>
<td>$15.00 for 7 days (Unlimited travel on Subway, Local Bus, Inner Harbor Ferry, and Commuter Rail Zone 1A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors and Persons with Disabilities (Blind persons ride for free)</td>
<td>$.40/Ride</td>
<td>$20/Month (Requires a Senior/T.A.P ID or Mass Commission for the Blind ID. No discounts apply to Express Bus Passes, Unlimited travel on Local Bus and Subway.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Junior High and High School)</td>
<td>$.60/Ride</td>
<td>$20/Month (Unlimited travel on Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Commuter Rail Zones 1, 1A and 2 until 8p.m. on school days. Requires Student ID Badge.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 11 and Under</td>
<td>Free (When accompanied by a paying adult.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CharlieCard: $1.25 FREE transfer to Local Bus and DISCOUNTED transfer to Subway & Express Bus $2.80 Inner Express (FREE Transfer to Subway), $4.00 Outer Express (FREE Transfer to Subway). 3°Charlie Ticket/Cash-on-board: $1.50 FREE transfer to Local Bus with Charlie Ticket—does not apply to cash-on-board rides. $3.50 Inner Express, $5.00 Outer Express 3°

**MBTA SUBWAY FARES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly LinkPass</td>
<td>$59.00/Month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3°Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/Week LinkPass</th>
<th>$9.00/Day</th>
<th>$15/7 Days (Unlimited travel on Subway, Local Bus, Commuter Rail Zone 1A, and Inner-Harbor Ferry.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors and Persons with Disabilities (Blind persons ride for free.)</td>
<td>$.60/Ride</td>
<td>$20/Month (Unlimited travel on Local Bus and Subway. Requires a Senior/T.A.P ID or Blind Access Card.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Junior High and High School)</td>
<td>$.85/Ride</td>
<td>$25/Month (Unlimited travel on Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Commuter Rail Zones 1, 1A and 2 until 8p.m. on school days. Requires Student ID Badge.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 11 and under.</td>
<td>Free (When accompanied by a paying adult.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Charlie Card: $1.70 FREE transfer to Local Bus DISCOUNTED transfer to Express Bus, CharlieTicket/ Cash-on-board: $2.00.

---

**MBTA COMMUTER RAIL FARES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1A: $1.70/ride</th>
<th>Zone 1A Pass: $59/month (Zone 1A pass also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, and Inner Harbor Ferries).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1: $4.25/ride</td>
<td>Zone 1 Pass: $135/month (Zone 1 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Inner Harbor Ferries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interzone 1: $2.00/ride</td>
<td>Interzone 1 Pass: $65/month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2: $4.75/ride</td>
<td>Zone 2 Pass: $151/month (Zone 2 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Inner Harbor Ferries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interzone 2: $2.25/ride</td>
<td>Interzone 2 Pass: $77/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3: $5.25/ride</td>
<td>Zone 3 Pass: $163/month (Zone 3 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Inner Harbor Ferries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interzone 3: $2.50/ride</td>
<td>Interzone 3 Pass: $89/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4: $5.75/ride</td>
<td>Zone 4 Pass: $186/month (Zone 4 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Inner Harbor Ferries.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interzone 4: $2.75/ride</td>
<td>Interzone 4 Pass: $101/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

302 Ibid.
| Zone 5: $6.25/ride | Zone 5 Pass: $210/month  
(Zone 5 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, Inner Harbor Ferries, and Commuter Boat.) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interzone 5: $3.00/ride</td>
<td>Interzone 5 Pass: $113/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Zone 6: $6.75/ride | Zone 6 Pass: $223/month  
(Zone 6 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, Inner Harbor Ferries, and Commuter Boat.) |
| Interzone 6: $3.50/ride | Interzone 6 Pass: $125/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.) |
| Zone 7: $7.25/ride | Zone 7 Pass: $235/month  
(Zone 7 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, Inner Harbor Ferries, and Commuter Boat.) |
| Interzone 7: $4.00/ride | Interzone 7 Pass: $137/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.) |
| Zone 8: $7.75/ride | Zone 8 Pass: $250/month  
(Zone 8 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, Inner Harbor Ferries, and Commuter Boat.) |
| Interzone 8: $4.50/ride | Interzone 8 Pass: $149/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.) |
| Zone 9: $8.25/ride | Zone 9 Pass: $265/month  
(Zone 9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus, Subway, Express Bus, Inner Harbor Ferries, and Commuter Boat.) |
| Interzone 9: $5.00/ride | Interzone 9 Pass: $161/month (Interzone 1-9 passes also good for unlimited travel on Local Bus.) |

*12-ride: $20.40 - $99.00 (Price depends on route/zone travel). See Zone/Interzone details below. Cash-on-board: $1.70 - $8.25: Price depends on route/zone travel. See Zone/Interzone details below. When purchasing a ticket on a train you may be subject to a surcharge, if that station has a ticket office or contracted vendor: $2.00 surcharge during peak hours (shaded columns in the public schedule) $1.00 surcharge during off-peak hours (non-shaded columns in the public schedule). 303

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniors and Persons with Disabilities (blind persons ride for free)</th>
<th>50% Off Rides, (Based on Commuter Rail ride fares noted above. 10-Ride Tickets Available at same 50% off rate.)</th>
<th>No Monthly Commuter Rail Pass discounts apply. (Requires a Senior/T.A.P. ID or Mass Commission for the Blind ID.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (Junior High and High School)</td>
<td>50% Off Rides, (Based on Commuter Rail ride fares noted above. 10-Ride Tickets Available at same 50% off rate.)</td>
<td>$20/month (Unlimited travel on Bus, Subway, Express Bus, and Commuter Rail Zones 1A, 1 and 2 until 11PM on school days. Requires Student ID Badge. No discounts on other Commuter Rail routes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In a comparison between MARTA, BART, and MBTA’s bus schedules, all of the
seem to begin service between 4:30 am and 5:00 am on weekdays. MARTa’s bus line
makes its last stop at 1:30 am on weekdays. BART’s bus line makes its last stop around
midnight on weekdays (in many cases service extends past midnight). MBTA’s bus line
makes its last stop at 1:45 am on weekdays.

In reference to the weekend schedule, MARTA begins its service as early as 5:00
am and ends at 12:30 am. BART’s bus lines begin service at 6:00 am on Saturdays and
8:00 am on Sundays, but it makes its last stop around midnight (in many cases service
extends past midnight). MBTA’s bus lines begin service as early as 4:33 am on
Saturdays and make its last stop at 1:45 am. MBTA’s Sunday schedule starts at 4:55 am
and it makes its last stop at 1:46 am.

MARTA’s rail system begins service at 4:41 am and makes its last stop at 2:10 on
Saturdays. BART’s rail system begins service at 4:00 am and makes its last stop at
midnight on Saturdays (in many cases service extends past midnight). MBTA’s rail
system begins service at 4:56 am and makes its last stop at 1:05 am on Saturdays. All of
three of the transit stations begin their service within the four o’clock hour on Saturdays.

MARTA’s rail system begins service at 5:50 am and makes its last stop at 1:55
am on Sundays. BART’s rail system begins service at 8:00 am and makes its last stop at
midnight on Sundays (in many cases service extends past midnight). MBTA’s rail
system begins service at 5:25 am and makes its last stop at 1:05 am on Sundays.
MARTA and MBTA begin service on Sunday within the five o’clock hour, while BART does not begin service until 8:00 am.

### TRANSIT SERVICE PRICE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>$2.13-$2.50</td>
<td>$2.13-$2.50</td>
<td>$2.13-$2.50</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.64-$10.55</td>
<td>$3.64-$12.55</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>$1.25-$1.50</td>
<td>$1.70-$2.00</td>
<td>$1.70-$3.50</td>
<td>$59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranges reflect differences based on time (peak vs. off-peak), distance traveled, and/or prepaid purchase. Boston price ranges represent difference between CharlieCard and CharlieTicket prices.*

### PARATRANSIT SERVICE PRICE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Paratransit Fare</th>
<th>“Premium” Paratransit Fare</th>
<th>Paratransit Door to Door</th>
<th>Paratransit Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Curb to Curb</td>
<td>No service outside 3/4 mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>$2.00-$6.75</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Door to Door</td>
<td>Premium service is a taxi debit card program, offers same-day service, possibly covers small areas outside 3/4 mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Door to Door</td>
<td>Premium fare currently means that non-ADA trips are allowed (at regular fare) - outside 3/4 mile limit and/or same-day and/or outside service hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranges reflect differences based on time (peak vs. off-peak), distance traveled, and/or prepaid purchase.*

### TEN-YEAR CHRONOLOGY OF FARE INCREASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fare Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

305 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2002, there has been a 70% ($0.75) fare increase. MARTA fares increase from $1.75 to $2.00 between the years of 2009 and 2010. This was a 87.5% ($0.25) increase. MARTA fares increased the following year from $2.00 to $2.50. This was an 80% ($0.50) increase from the previous year, a 7.5% difference.

In a fare comparison, MARTA is the only transit authority that has a standard fare as oppose to its counterparts BART and MBTA, which fares vary depending on the distances traveled. This could become costly for patrons of BART and MBTA. Like MARTA’s Breeze Card, META has a Charlie Card. It is more beneficial to create a MyCharlie Account, if you plan on using your Charlie Card for more than a month. The account will allow you set up recurring monthly pass purchases and provides "No Worries Protection" in case of loss, theft, or damage to your card.308

The Victoria Transport Policy Institute has separated transportation equity into three major categories: Horizontal Equity, Vertical Equity with regard to income and

---


class, and Vertical Equity with regard to mobility need and ability. The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s situation relates to all three categories of transportation equity. It relates horizontally by how the fare increase impacts the entire ridership of MARTA. Whether it is a negative or positive impact, everyone is impacted. According to the surveys conducted, African Americans are the number one demographic that uses MARTA as a primary means of transportation. These results draw the conclusion that if there were a negative or positive impact, African Americans would be affected the most. Consumers are receiving the goods and services they are paying for. Some might argue that the entire population of riders bears the cost of service tax and fare increase. Some might also argue that Fulton and Dekalb counties should bear the cost of service taxes. According to the survey results there are residents from other counties besides Fulton and Dekalb that use MARTA. My argument is that all of the counties should bear the cost of service taxes. These counties should include Fulton, Dekalb, Cobb, Clayton, and Gwinnett.

Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s situation relates vertically with regard to income and social class in that the impacts are distributed among groups, more specifically social class. Vertical equity (also called social justice, environmental justice, and social inclusion) is concerned with the distribution of impacts between individuals and groups that differ in abilities and needs, in this case, by income or social class. By this definition, transport policies are equitable if they favor economically and socially disadvantaged groups, therefore compensating for overall inequities. According to the

survey results, the impact of the price increase and the discontinuing of bus lines affects the disadvantaged population the most, African Americans. Policies favoring disadvantaged groups are called *progressive*, while those that excessively burden disadvantaged people are called *regressive*. This definition is used to support affordable modes, discounts and special services for economically and socially disadvantaged groups, and efforts to insure that disadvantaged groups do not bear an excessive share of external costs (pollution, accident risk, financial costs, etc.).\(^{310}\) The price increase may come across as an inconsideration to many, but in order to stay afloat a price increase had to happen. The discontinuing of bus lines was also an effort to stay above water.

The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority also concerns vertical equity with regard to mobility need and ability. Vertical equity with regard to mobility need and ability is concerned with the distribution of impacts between individuals and groups that differ in transportation ability and need, and therefore the degree to which the transportation system meets the needs of travelers with special constraints. This definition is used to support *universal design* (also called *accessible* and *inclusive* design), which means that transport facilities and services accommodate people with disabilities and other special needs ("Universal Design," VTPI, 2005).\(^{311}\) MARTA provides transportation and accessibility to persons with disabilities and special needs, for example handicap accessible ramps at every station, and on every bus. According to Victoria Transport Policy Institute, these concepts can be measured through public facilities and

\(^{310}\) Ibid.

\(^{311}\) Ibid.
services, user costs and benefits, service quality, economic impacts, and regulation and enforcement.312

MARTA SERVICE CUTS TO DATE

More service cuts are expected to could happen in the near future. MARTA General Manager Beverly Scott issued a public warning on Monday that the transit agency needed to start preparing for deep service cuts. This is a result of the state legislature failing to lift regulations on how much it can spend on operations, in addition to projections that sales tax revenues will come up $130 million short in the next five years of what had been previously projected. The sales tax is MARTA main source of funding. This means the agency will have to make cuts to ensure it has the $40 million in operating reserves required by law. MARTA can only spend half the sales tax revenues on operations. The legislature suspended that state regulation to give the transit agency more financial flexibility but that exemption from the law ends in June 2013, do to economic downturn. MARTA expects to keep the exemption for at least three more years, but without it they expect to lose a projected total of $9.7 million during that time. This amount does not seem to be much in a $400 million operating budget, but at a time when MARTA is struggling financially it is crucial. They had wanted the state government regulation lifted permanently but had agreed to a compromise of suspending it for an additional three years. A cadre of house Democrats, however, fought the compromise because they opposed a short-term fix and also an aspect of the bill that

undercut the Fulton County's Commission's board appointments.313

Board Chairman Frederick L. Daniels said an upcoming management audit could identify inefficiencies that MARTA could target for savings. He also said that MARTA management's own internal reviews should identify other savings to keep service cuts from being draconian. "I don't want our message to the public to be that immediately we are going to slash and burn," he said. "We have to be thoughtful at what we put on the table."314

The Chief Financial Officer for MARTA, Davis Allen, presented figures that showed their potential to alleviate the financial crunch in 2016 by a number of measures including increasing health care contributions from non-union employees from 15 to 25 percent for $4 million in savings by 2016 and cuts in management for an additional $8 million. It also showed how MARTA expects to collect $10 million more than anticipated in fares during that period. Davis said, MARTA's financial reserves will fall from a projected $132 million this coming fiscal year to $23 million in five years.315

State Rep. Mike Jacobs, the Atlanta Republican who chairs as state board overseeing MARTA, said that the legislature could pass the three-year compromise early next legislative session and give the transit agency some more flexibility.316

"It was a shame that House bill 1052 was torpedoed," Jacobs said. "I think it is going to be very important for the legislative leadership, including me, to work behind the scenes with MARTA to assure them that we will keep the commitment we made to give them an extra three years of relief. Having made that compromise, it becomes a promise on which we should deliver."317


314 Ibid.

315 Ibid.

316 Ibid.
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Scott, however, noted that the compromise still would not make the MARTA funding model sustainable for the long term. She and other officials said the current financial projections left open the possibility that some projects might not be feasible even if voters approved a regional sales this July that has $600 million for MARTA for maintenance and upgrades for the aging system. MARTA still won't have enough money to provide for long-term operating costs and maintenance under current projections, they said. "If we don't have the ability to maintain it, we can't do it," said Dwight Ferrell, chief operating officer.\textsuperscript{318} 

\textsuperscript{317} Ibid. 

\textsuperscript{318} Ibid.
CHAPTER IV
SURVEY RESULTS

Which station do you frequent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Points</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbergh</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3
Std. Dev. = 1.417
N = 300
Is MARTA your primary means of transportation?

Mean = 1.12
Std. Dev. = .329
N = 300
According to the survey responses, 263 (87%) responded “Yes” and 37 (12%) responded “No” to the question “Is MARTA your primary means of transportation?” Therefore, out of the population surveyed, MARTA serves as the primary means of transportation for more than 75% of its riders.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should increase fares in order to continue service to all MARTA stops.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should decrease fares, and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARTA should increase fares in order to continue service to all MARTA stops.</th>
<th>MARTA should decrease fares, and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares and Cross-products</td>
<td>525.797</td>
<td>19.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>19.973</td>
<td>888.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares and Cross-products</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>2.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should increase fares and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should decrease fares, and continue service to less used MARTA stops.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARTA should increase fares and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.</th>
<th>MARTA should decrease fares, and continue service to less used MARTA stops.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares and Cross-products</td>
<td>194.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should increase service taxes in Dekalb and Fulton Counties.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a service tax charged to Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARTA should increase service taxes in Dekalb and Fulton Counties.</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Sum of Squares and Cross-products</th>
<th>Covariance</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be a service tax charged to Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties.</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>978.437</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should extend</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lines further North,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East, and West.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The price increase on</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Breeze ticket and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card affects me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARTA should extend lines further North, South, East, and West.</th>
<th>The price increase on the Breeze ticket and/or card affects me.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTA should extend</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lines further North,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East, and West.</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350.917</td>
<td>19.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares and</td>
<td>Sum of Squares and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-products</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>Cross-products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>Covariance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The price increase</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the Breeze ticket:</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or card affects</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me.</td>
<td>Sum of Squares and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.733</td>
<td>743.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>2.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which county do you live in?

Mean = 1.43
Std. Dev. = .956
N = 300
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 300 participants in the survey, the highest number of MARTA’s patrons live in Fulton County [205 (68.3%)]. Fulton and Dekalb have the most riders, and respectfully so. The least amount [2 (.7%)] responded with other, stating they do not live in Metropolitan Atlanta. This number seems to be large, but it is not more than 75%.
What is your age?

Mean = 2.54
Std. Dev. = 1.312
N = 300
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and Under</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 to 34</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MARTA’s largest population of patrons falls in the age range of “22 to 34” [110 (36.7%)]. It is then followed by “21 and Under” [68 (22.7%)]. According to the survey results, the older the person is the less reliant on MARTA they become. As the ages increase, the ridership decreases. However, it is important to mention that patrons that fall in the age range of “21 and Under” have a significant frequency level of riders [68 (22.7%)]. The smallest population of patron that use MARTA falls in the age range of “65 and Over”. [7 (2.3%)].

What is your race?

- Mean = 2.06
- Std. Dev. = .601
- N = 300
| What is your race? |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid White      | 27        | 8.9     | 9.0            | 9.0               |
| Black            | 248       | 82.1    | 82.7           | 91.7              |
| Latino           | 6         | 2.0     | 2.0            | 93.7              |
| Other            | 19        | 6.3     | 6.3            | 100.0             |
| Total            | 300       | 99.3    | 100.0          |                   |
| Missing System   | 2         | .7      |                |                   |
| Total            | 302       | 100.0   |                |                   |

According to the survey results, Blacks use MARTA the most [248 (82.7%)]. This is a significant amount, because it is more than 75%. The other 25% is made up of the other races (white, latino, and other). Whites came in second totaling 27 (9%) surveyed. Latinos came in third totaling 6 (2%) surveyed.
What is your income level?

Mean = 2.3
Std. Dev. = 1.411
N = 300
The survey results show that 128 (42.7%) of the 300 participants surveyed have an income level of "$0-$8,500". This is nearly 50% of its patrons. As their income levels increase, the number starts to decrease slightly. Based on the statistics, the more money the patrons make, the less reliance on MARTA they have.
What is your level of education?

Mean = 1.66
Std. Dev. = .647
N = 300
What is your level of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the survey responses, there are more college-educated people using MARTA than anyone else [153 (51%)]. The second highest number would be for high school educated [126 (42.0)]. The third highest amount was for graduate degreeed persons [17 (5.7%)]. I only survey 4 (1.3%) people that attended professional school.

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Is MARTA your primary means of transportation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Male</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey result show that there are more women [157 (52.3%) that use MARTA as a means of transportation than men [143 (47.7%)].
What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined the regime of the Metro Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) and their reasons for eliminating bus lines and increasing the fares charged to its patrons. It also explains why MARTA plans to eliminate more bus lines in the future. This transportation issue is significant, because it is key to large metropolitan areas as MARTA is the primary and secondary means of urban transportation for the people that live in Metropolitan Atlanta.

These decisions also affect individuals who use MARTA’s “Park and Ride” system as a secondary means of transportation. The population that is impacted by these changes are people who live in metropolitan areas. If MARTA continues to cut lines and/or raise fares, people that live in the suburban areas (due to gentrification) and those already living in the suburbs may not have access to jobs, work, school, doctor’s appointments, etc.

With massive growth, transportation issues have had major effects on the city of Atlanta and the surrounding communities. Although MARTA’s fares are currently increasing, they continue to cut bus lines. Many of MARTA’s customers are dissatisfied with the decisions to discontinue these services. Customers feel that they are being “let down” and inconvenienced by MARTA. Although, MARTA is providing explanations for their actions, some of their customers do not feel these explanations are being justified. Many of MARTA’s customers depend on its services as a primary, as well as the “Park and Ride” system, a secondary means of transportation. According to MARTA’s official website, www.itsmarta.com, effective October 3, 2010 fares increased
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and the maximum number of children allowed to ride MARTA, at no cost under 46” tall decreased.319

This topic has a substantive impact on the study of Urban Politics, Public Policy, as well as Environmental Justice. The overall objective of this research was to discover how the Metro Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority is being administered, regulated, and funded, as well as its current impact on the community. This study explored the determinant factors in the board’s decisions to eliminate routes; what judgments went into MARTA officials’ consideration on how these decisions would affect the community as well as to what extent. This study has developed some alternatives to current administration, regulations, and funding.

Most major cities throughout the United States have a public transportation system, which is easily accessible and affordable. According to Urban Transport: From Theory To Reality, the purpose of public transportation is to provide maximum benefit to the community, there should be a clear understanding of its public purpose. Public transport is supported by taxpayers and ratepayers: to serve a social need by facilitating mobility for the disadvantaged (those without access to automobiles by virtue of low income or disability) and to serve an environmental need by providing an alternative to the automobile and thereby reducing traffic congestion, air pollution and energy consumption.320


The metropolitan area of Atlanta utilizes metro lines, buses, and shuttles, all under the operation of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA). In order to ride MARTA, the rider obtains a Breeze Card or Breeze Ticket.\(^{321}\) Breeze tickets will no longer be sold at MARTA Ride Stores or Breeze Vending Machines. They will continue to be distribute through Group Sales Programs, K-12 Program and special events. Tickets will continue to be accepted as valid fare media on Bus and Rail (effective 10/2/2011).\(^{322}\) The Breeze Ticket may be purchased for fifty cents and additional fare may be added at the time of purchase. The Breeze Card may be purchased for $1 and additional fares may be added at the purchase. It may store up to $100 in cash value.\(^{323}\) The fares for MARTA are single $2.00 fare ($2.50 effective 10/2/2011) covers one-way bus or train trips, including transfers.\(^{324}\)

MARTA has helped to increase the economic growth and development of the Atlanta metropolitan area. MARTA has had a major influence on corporations’ decisions to locate and/or relocate in Atlanta.\(^{325}\) MARTA has helped Atlanta live up to its image as a world-class city steeped in a rich history of transportation. There was a study conducted by the American Public Transit Association (APTA). In 2001, APTA


\(^{323}\) Ibid.


discovered that public transportation use in the Atlanta area saved 19.3 million gallons of gasoline, and kept more than 300 million pounds of pollutants out of the air.\textsuperscript{326} MARTA has one of the largest fleets of compressed natural gas buses in the nation, increasing mobility while reducing pollution. MARTA's availability saves Atlanta residents approximately 25 million man-hours in traffic delays. Essentially, public transportation reduces gasoline usage by commuters, air pollutants, and traffic delays.\textsuperscript{327} At the same time, it offers its clientele easy accessibility, affordable rates, flexible schedules, and alternative means of transportation.\textsuperscript{328}

SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY

I distributed and collected three hundred surveys at the top five Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) Stations: College Park, Five Points, Kensington, Lindbergh, and West End. There were sixty surveys distributed at each station. In order for me to conduct the survey, I had to contact Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s (MARTA) Communication Department to get permission to distribute the surveys. I found that participants “21 and Under” and “22 to 34” were more willing to participate in the survey than persons in the age ranges of “35 to 44”, ”45 to 54”, ”55 to 64”, and “65 and Over”.


\textsuperscript{327} Ibid.

According to the survey responses, 263 (87%) responded “Yes” and 37 (12%) responded “No” to the question “Is MARTA your primary means of transportation?” Therefore, out of the population surveyed, MARTA serves as the primary means of transportation for more than 75% of its riders. The survey results show that MARTA’s highest clientele come from the black population. Blacks use MARTA the most [248 (82.7%)], when compared to other races. This is a significant amount, because it is more than 75%. The other 25% is made up of the other races (white, latino, and other). Out of the 300 participants in the survey, the highest number of MARTA’s patrons live in Fulton County [205 (68.3%)]. Fulton and Dekalb have the most riders, and respectfully so. The least amount [2 (.7)%] responded with other, stating they do not live in Metropolitan Atlanta. This number seems to be large, but it is not more than 75%.

MARTA’s largest population of patrons falls in the age range of “22 to 34” [110 (36.7%)]. It is then followed by “21 and Under” [68 (22.7%)]. According to the survey results, the older the person is the less reliant on MARTA they become. As the ages increase, the ridership decreases. However, it is important to mention that patrons that fall in the age range of “21 and Under” have a significant frequency level of riders [68 (22.7%)]. The smallest population of patron that use MARTA falls in the age range of “65 and Over” [7 (2.3%)]. According to the survey responses, there are more college-educated people using MARTA than anyone else [153 (51%)]. The second highest number would be for high school educated [126 (42.0)]. The third highest amount was for graduate degreed persons [17 (5.7%)]. I only survey 4 (1.3%) people that attended professional school.

The survey results show that 128 (42.7%) of the 300 participants surveyed have
an income level of "$0-$8,500". This is nearly 50% of its patrons. As their income levels increase, the number starts to decrease slightly. Based on the statistics, the more money the patrons make, the less reliance on MARTA they have. The survey results show that there are more women [157 (52.3%)] that use MARTA as a means of transportation than men [143 (47.7%)].

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Central Research Question: "What modifications would allow the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority the ability to maintain services and not increase fares?"

Hypothesis: By charging Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties service charges, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority would more likely maintain services and not increase fares. In order for the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) to maintain services, and not increase fares, they may choose one of the following or a combination of these options.

Recommendation 1: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should begin charging the following counties a service tax of one percent, inclusive to the service tax being charged to Fulton and DeKalb Counties: Cobb, Gwinnett, and Clayton.

Recommendation 2: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should allow the government to provide financial resources to keep it afloat, the same as most public transit systems such as Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) use.
Recommendation 3: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should change their standard rate from $2.50 to rates comparable to Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA). They should now base the fare on the distance the customer intends on traveling.

Recommendation 4: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should raise the fare if and only if they provide new routes to replace the routes they discontinued. These bus stops should be easily accessible.

Recommendation 5: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should consider extending their current hours of operation to 24 hours, 7 days a week. These extended hours will require MARTA to increase their fares for those persons using the services after hours, in order to pay the operators.

Recommendation 6: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should maintain its current fare of $2.50, but seek financial resources to help aid the cost of implementing more routes.

Recommendation 7: The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should supplement its services with a shuttle service that provides transportation for persons that need transportation during non-operational hours. The fare should be 10%-15% higher than the $2.50 already being charged or to rates comparable to Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA).

Recommendation 8:
The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) should consider receiving governmental funds as their counterparts do.

CONTRIBUTION TO LITERATURE

During my research, I have not come across such a study as this one. I hope that my research will provide recommendations to the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority to help resolve any misunderstanding between the community and the Board of Directors. This literature will also serve as a guide for future scholars who take interest in the discipline of Political Science, more specifically Urban Politics, Public Policy, and Environmental Justice.

LIMITATIONS

There were some limitations that I encountered in conducting the survey research. I was restricted to conduct surveys only at the entrance gates and bus bays. I was not allowed to go onto the loading deck or onto the trains to conduct surveys. There were many people who did not feel the need to participate in the survey, because they feel the price increase and the discontinuing of lines does not affect them. The first station I surveyed was the Kensington Station. It took approximately five hours and thirty minutes to conduct the survey research. There was a large amount of non-traditional students that frequent the station due to the relocation of Dekalb County Public Schools’ Open Campus High School located on North Druid Hills Road. These students now have to commute to Stone Mountain Industrial to attend school. The new location is much further out for those living in the inner city. A lot of the students complained about the price increase, because they cannot afford it. Some of them informed me that they
receive their cards from their social workers.

The second station I surveyed was Lindbergh Station. Many of the people that frequent the station work in the Lindbergh District. It took approximately five hours and fifteen minutes to conduct the survey research. Many of the riders are Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) employees. This created some limitations for me, because I was not allowed to survey them due to a conflict of interest. I also encountered a large number of Latinos. I was not able to survey many of them, because they did not speak English.

The third station I attempted to survey was the Airport Station. When I arrived, I noticed that the pace of the foot traffic was very swift and the people were not willing to stop. I asked one of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s (MARTA) police officers near the entrance/exit about the traffic at the station. At first she ignored me, then she finally replied that the Airport Station would not be an ideal place to conduct surveys. I immediately left and traveled down to the College Park Station.

It took approximately three hours and fifteen minutes to conduct the survey research at the College Park Station. While surveying participants at the College Park Station, there was also a middle-aged man that I asked to participate in the survey. He was terrified to do so. He explained to me that he had been in trouble with the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), and that he found not afford to get into any more trouble. I had to explain to him that the survey research was approved by the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s (MARTA) Communication Department, and he would not be penalized for participating. He still refused to
participate in fear of being arrested or being ticketed.

The fourth station I surveyed was the West End Station. It took approximately two hours and twenty minutes to conduct the survey research. I was expecting a majority of my survey participants to come from the Atlanta University Center (Clark Atlanta University, Interdenominational Theological Center, Morehouse College, and Spelman College). The final station I surveyed was the Five Points Station. It took approximately two hours and fifteen minutes to conduct the survey research. This station has high traffic and is one of the largest MARTA stations in the city of Atlanta.

SELF-REFLECTION

The survey research was the most interesting portion of this research. It gave me the opportunity to interact with many different types of people. I found myself listening to people’s personal stories of unemployment, illnesses, etc. It also gave me the opportunity to ride the MARTA train to my survey locations. I now use MARTA’s Park and Ride system to commute to and from work. I am what many would call a “choice rider”. Choice riders are those persons who use MARTA a secondary means of transportation. It saves me gas, mileage, and time. As a resident of the city of Atlanta and Fulton County, I am charged a 1% service tax. I also have my own personal transportation. I was not made aware of this service tax until I began my research. I now utilize the service of which I pay for.
APPENDIX
SURVEY

Please make a selection to the following questions and statements.

Research Question: "To what extent would the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority be likely to maintain services and not increase fares?"

1. Is MARTA your primary means of transportation?
   ____Yes ____No

2. MARTA should increase fares in order to continue service to all MARTA stops.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

3. MARTA should decrease fares, and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

4. MARTA should increase fares and discontinue service to less used MARTA stops.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

5. MARTA should decrease fares, and continue service to less used MARTA stops.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

6. MARTA should increase service taxes in Dekalb and Fulton counties.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

7. MARTA should extend lines further North, South, East, and West.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

8. There should be a service tax charged to Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties.
   Strongly Agree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Disagree

9. The price increase on the Breeze ticket and/or card affects me:
   Strongly  1  2  3  4  5  Moderately
10. Which county do you live in?
   ___Fulton ___Dekalb ___Cobb ___Clayton ___Gwinnett ___Other

11. What is your age?
   ___21 and Under
   ___22 to 34
   ___35 to 44
   ___45 to 54
   ___55 to 64
   ___65 and Over

12. What is your Gender?
   ___Male ___Female

13. What is your race?
   ___White ___Black ___Latino ___Other

14. What is your income level
   ___$0- $8,500
   ___$8,501- $15,000
   ___$15,001- $25,000
   ___$25,001- $35,000
   ___$35,001- $60,000+

15. What is your level of education?
   ___High School ___College ___Graduate ___Professional
September 9, 2011

Nicolas R. Rankin
Clark Atlanta University
Department of Political Science
223 James P. Brawley Dr. SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)
2424 Piedmont Road NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30324

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a graduate student at Clark-Atlanta University. I am conducting research on “TRANSPORTATION: THE REGULATION AND FUNDING OF METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY (MARTA) AND TRANSPORTATION EQUITY” (CASE STUDY APPROACH).” As a major component of my dissertation, and for it to be successful I am requesting permission to conduct survey research at MARTA Stations.

Any information used in this research will remain confidential. The information will be used for statistical and non-statistical purposes only. I will also provide you with a copy of my findings. Attached to this letter, you will a copy of my Institutional Review Board approval letter and a copy of the survey to be administered.

Should you require any additional information concerning this request, please contact my dissertation chair, Dr. R. Benneson DeJanes at 404-800-8241 or rdejanese@cau.edu. You may contact me at 404-822-5492 or email me at rankin.nicolas@gmail.com. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Nicolas R. Rankin
September 29, 2011

Nicolas R. Rankin
585 McWilliams Rd SE #2303
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Dr. R DeJanes
Department of Political Science
233 James P. Brawley St. SE
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Lyle V. Harris
Chief Spokesman & Media Relations Press Officer
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority
2424 Piedmont Rd, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30324

RE: Waiver of Liability

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is written in reference to a waiver of liability between the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority and myself. I, Nicolas R. Rankin, release the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority of any liabilities, due to any bodily harm or injury that could possibly occur during the collection of my dissertation survey research at the top five MARTA Stations.

Sincerely,

Nicolas R. Rankin 

Date

Dr. R. DeJanes 

Date
PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

PREAMBLE

WE THE PEOPLE OF COLOR, gathered together at this multinational People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, to begin to build a national and international movement of all peoples of color to fight the destruction and taking of our lands and communities, do hereby re-establish our spiritual interdependence to the sacredness of our Mother Earth; to respect and celebrate each of our cultures, languages and beliefs about the natural world and our roles in healing ourselves; to insure environmental justice; to promote economic alternatives which would contribute to the development of environmentally safe livelihoods; and, to secure our political, economic and cultural liberation that has been denied for over 500 years of colonization and oppression, resulting in the poisoning of our communities and land and the genocide of our peoples, do affirm and adopt these Principles of Environmental Justice:

1. Environmental justice affirms the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction.

2. Environmental justice demands that public policy be based on mutual respect and justice for all peoples, free from any form of discrimination or bias.

3. Environmental justice mandates the right to ethical, balanced and responsible uses of land and renewable resources in the interest of a sustainable planet for humans and other living things.

4. Environmental justice calls for universal protection from nuclear testing, extraction, production and disposal of toxic/hazardous wastes and poisons and nuclear testing that threaten the fundamental right to clean air, land, water, and food.
5. Environmental justice affirms the fundamental right to political, economic, cultural and environmental self-determination of all peoples.

6. Environmental justice demands the cessation of the production of all toxins, hazardous wastes, and radioactive materials, and that all past and current producers be held strictly accountable to the people for detoxification and the containment at the point of production.

7. Environmental justice demands the right to participate as equal partners at every level of decision-making including needs assessment, planning, implementation, enforcement and evaluation.

8. Environmental justice affirms the right of all workers to a safe and healthy work environment, without being forced to choose between an unsafe livelihood and unemployment. It also affirms the right of those who work at home to be free from environmental hazards.

9. Environmental justice protects the right of victims of environmental injustice to receive full compensation and reparations for damages as well as quality health care.


12. Environmental justice affirms the need for urban and rural ecological policies to clean up and rebuild our cities and rural areas in balance with nature, honoring the cultural
integrity of all our communities, and providing fair access for all to the full range of resources.

13. Environmental justice calls for the strict enforcement of principles of informed consent, and a halt to the testing of experimental reproductive and medical procedures and vaccinations on people of color.

14. Environmental justice opposes the destructive operations of multi-national corporations.

15. Environmental justice opposes military occupation, repression and exploitation of lands, peoples and cultures, and other life forms.

16. Environmental justice calls for the education of present and future generations which emphasizes social and environmental issues, based on our experience and an appreciation of our diverse cultural perspectives.

17. Environmental justice requires that we, as individuals, make personal and consumer choices to consume as little of Mother Earth's resources and to produce as little waste as possible; and make the conscious decision to challenge and reprioritize our lifestyles to insure the health of the natural world for present and future generations.

Adopted today, October 27, 1991, in Washington, D.C.
EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12898

FEDERAL ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IN MINORITY POPULATIONS AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1-1. Implementation

1-101. Agency Responsibilities. To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Marianas Islands.

1-102. Creation of an Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice. (a) Within 3 months of the date of this order, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency ("Administrator") or the Administrator's designee shall convene an interagency Federal Working Group on Environmental Justice ("Working Group"). The Working Group shall comprise the heads of the following executive agencies and offices or their designees: (a) Department of Defense; (b) Department of Health and Human Services; (c) Department of Housing and Urban Development; (d) Department of Labor; (e) Department of Agriculture; (f) Department of Transportation; (g) Department of Justice; (h) Department of the Interior; (i) Department of Commerce; (j) Department of Energy; (k) Environmental Protection Agency; (l) Office of Management and Budget; (m) Office of Science and Technology Policy; (n) Office of the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy; (o) Office of the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; (p) National Economic Council; (q) Council of Economic Advisers; and (r) such other Government officials as the President may designate. The Working Group shall report to the president through the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy and the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy.

(b) The Working Group shall: (1) provide guidance to Federal agencies on criteria for identifying disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations;

(2) coordinate with, provide guidance to, and serve as a clearinghouse for, each Federal agency as it develops an environmental justice strategy as required by section 1-103 of this order, in order to ensure that the administration, interpretation and enforcement of programs, activities and policies are undertaken in a consistent manner;

(3) assist in coordinating research by, and stimulating cooperation among, the
Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other agencies conducting research or other activities in accordance with section 3-3 of this order;

(4) assist in coordinating data collection, required by this order;

(5) examine existing data and studies on environmental justice;

(6) hold public meetings as required in section 5-502(d) of this order; and

(7) develop interagency model projects on environmental justice that evidence cooperation among Federal agencies.

1-103. Development of Agency Strategies. (a) Except as provided in section 6-605 of this order, each Federal agency shall develop an agency-wide environmental justice strategy, as set forth in subsections (b)-(e) of this section that identifies and addresses disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The environmental justice strategy shall list programs, policies, planning and public participation processes, enforcement and/or rule makings related to human health or the environment that should be revised to, at a minimum: (1) promote enforcement of all health and environmental statutes in areas with minority populations and low-income populations; (2) ensure greater public participation; (3) improve research and data collection relating to the health of and environment of minority populations and low-income populations; and (4) identify differential patterns of consumption of natural resources among minority populations and low-income populations. In addition, the environmental justice strategy shall include, where appropriate, a timetable for undertaking identified revisions and consideration of economic and social implications of the revisions.

(b) Within 4 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall identify an internal administrative process for developing its environmental justice strategy, and shall inform the Working Group of the process.

(c) Within 6 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall provide the Working Group with an outline of its proposed environmental justice strategy.

(d) Within 10 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall provide the Working Group with its proposed environmental justice strategy.

(e) Within 12 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall finalize its environmental justice strategy and provide a copy and written description of its strategy to the Working Group. During the 12 month period from the date of this order, each Federal agency, as part of its environmental justice strategy, shall identify several specific projects that can be promptly undertaken to address particular concerns identified during
the development of the proposed environmental justice strategy and a schedule for implementing those projects.

(f) Within 24 months of the date of this order, each Federal agency shall report to the Working Group on its progress in implementing its agency-wide environmental justice strategy.

(g) Federal agencies shall provide additional periodic reports to the Working Group as requested by the Working Group.

1-104. Reports to the President. Within 14 months of the date of this order, the Working Group shall submit to the President, through the Office of the Deputy Assistant to the President for Environmental Policy and the Office of the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, a report that describes the implementation of this order, and includes the final environmental justice strategies described in section 1-103(e) of this order.

Section 2-2. Federal Agency Responsibilities for Federal Programs

Each Federal agency shall conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment, in a manner that ensures that such programs, policies, and activities do not have the effect of excluding persons (including populations) from participation in, denying persons (including populations) the benefits of, or subjecting persons (including populations) to discrimination under, such programs, policies, and activities, because of their race, color, or national origin.

Section 3-3. Research, Data Collection, and Analysis

3-301. Human Health and Environmental Research and Analysis. (a) Environmental human health research, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall include diverse segments of the population in epidemiological and clinical studies, including segments at high risk from environmental hazards, such as minority populations, low-income populations and workers who may be exposed to substantial environmental hazards.

(b) Environmental human health analyses, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall identify multiple and cumulative exposures.

(c) Federal agencies shall provide minority populations and low-income populations the opportunity to comment on the development and design of research strategies undertaken pursuant to this order.

3-302. Human Health and Environmental Data Collection and Analysis. To the extent permitted by existing law, including the Privacy Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. section 552a): (a) each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information assessing and comparing environmental and human health risks borne by populations identified by race, national origin, or income. To the
extent practical and appropriate, Federal agencies shall use this information to determine whether their programs, policies, and activities have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations;

(b) In connection with the development and implementation of agency strategies in section 1-103 of this order, each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain and analyze information on the race, national origin, income level, and other readily accessible and appropriate information for areas surrounding facilities or sites expected to have a substantial environmental, human health, or economic effect on the surrounding populations, when such facilities or sites become the subject of a substantial Federal environmental administrative or judicial action. Such information shall be made available to the public, unless prohibited by law; and

(c) Each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information on the race, national origin, income level, and other readily accessible and appropriate information for areas surrounding Federal facilities that are: (1) subject to the reporting requirements under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, 42 U.S.C. section 11001-11050 as mandated in Executive Order No. 12856; and (2) expected to have a substantial environmental, human health, or economic effect on surrounding populations. Such information shall be made available to the public, unless prohibited by law.

(d) In carrying out the responsibilities in this section, each Federal agency, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall share information and eliminate unnecessary duplication of efforts through the use of existing data systems and cooperative agreements among Federal agencies and with State, local, and tribal governments.

Section 4-4. Subsistence Consumption of Fish and Wildlife

4-401. Consumption Patterns. In order to assist in identifying the need for ensuring protection of populations with differential patterns of subsistence consumption of fish and wildlife, Federal agencies, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall collect, maintain, and analyze information on the consumption patterns of populations who principally rely on fish and/or wildlife for subsistence. Federal agencies shall communicate to the public the risks of those consumption patterns.

4-402. Guidance. Federal agencies, whenever practicable and appropriate, shall work in a coordinated manner to publish guidance reflecting the latest scientific information available concerning methods for evaluating the human health risks associated with the consumption of pollutant-bearing fish or wildlife. Agencies shall consider such guidance in developing their policies and rules.

Section 5-5. Public Participation and Access to Information
(a) The public may submit recommendations to Federal agencies relating to the incorporation of environmental justice principles into Federal agency programs or policies. Each Federal agency shall convey such recommendations to the Working Group.

(b) Each Federal agency may, whenever practicable and appropriate, translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for limited English speaking populations.

(c) Each Federal agency shall work to ensure that public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public.

(d) The Working Group shall hold public meetings, as appropriate, for the purpose of fact-finding, receiving public comments, and conducting inquiries concerning environmental justice. The Working Group shall prepare for public review a summary of the comments and recommendations discussed at the public meetings.

Section 6-6. General Provisions

6-601. Responsibility for Agency Implementation. The head of each Federal agency shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with this order. Each Federal agency shall conduct internal reviews and take such other steps as may be necessary to monitor compliance with this order.

6-602. Executive Order No. 12250. This Executive order is intended to supplement but not supersede Executive Order No. 12250, which requires consistent and effective implementation of various laws prohibiting discriminatory practices in programs receiving Federal financial assistance. Nothing herein shall limit the effect or mandate of Executive Order No. 12250.

6-603. Executive Order No. 12875. This Executive order is not intended to limit the effect or mandate of Executive Order No. 12875.

6-604. Scope. For purposes of this order, Federal agency means any agency on the Working group, and such other agencies as may be designated by the President, that conducts any Federal program or activity that substantially affects human health or the environment. Independent agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this order.

6-605. Petitions for Exemptions. The head of a Federal agency may petition the President for an exemption from the requirements of this order on the grounds that all or some of the petitioning agency's programs or activities should not be subject to the requirements of this order.
6-606. Native American Programs. Each Federal agency responsibility set forth under this order shall apply equally to Native American programs. In addition, the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Working Group, and, after consultation with tribal leaders, shall coordinate steps to be taken pursuant to this order that address Federally-recognized Indian Tribes.

6-607. Costs. Unless otherwise provided by law, Federal agencies shall assume the financial costs of complying with this order.

6-608. General. Federal agencies shall implement this order consistent with, and to the extent permitted by, existing law.

6-609. Judicial Review. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, nor does it create any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person. This order shall not be construed to create any right to judicial review involving the compliance or non-compliance of the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other person with this order.

William J. Clinton  
The White House  
11 February 1994
US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ORDER
ON ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
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DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Office of the Secretary [OST Docket No. OST-95-141 (50125)] Department of Transportation (DOT) Order To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

AGENCY: Departmental Office of Civil Rights and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, DOT. ACTION: Notice of final DOT Order on environmental justice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation is issuing its final DOT Order, which will be used by DOT to comply with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The Order generally describes the process that the Office of the Secretary and each Operating Administration will use to incorporate environmental justice principles (as embodied in the Executive Order) into existing programs, policies, and activities. The Order provides that the Office of the Secretary and each Operating Administration within DOT will develop specific procedures to incorporate the goals of the DOT Order and the Executive Order with the programs, policies and activities which they administer or implement.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Executive Order 12898, as well as the President's February 11, 1994 Memorandum on Environmental Justice (sent to the heads of all departments and agencies), are intended to ensure that Federal departments and agencies identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their policies, programs and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

The DOT Environmental Justice Order is a key component of DOT’s June 21, 1995 Environmental Justice Strategy (60 FR 33896). The Order sets forth a process by which DOT and its Operating Administrations will integrate the goals of the Executive Order into their operations. This is to be done through a process developed within the framework of existing requirements, primarily the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title
VI), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (URA), the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), and other DOT applicable statutes, regulations and guidance that concern planning; social, economic, or environmental matters; public health or welfare; and public involvement. The Order is an internal directive to the various components of DOT and does not create any right to judicial review for compliance or noncompliance with its provisions.

In order to provide an opportunity for public input, a proposed version of this Order was published for comment on June 29, 1995 (60 FR 33899). A total of 30 written comments were received. Fifteen comments were received from state transportation or highway agencies, representing 20 state agencies (one letter was signed by ten state agencies, but four of those also sent individual comments). The other 15 comments included four from transit agencies, four from national organizations, two each from local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and citizens objecting to one particular project, and one from a professional association.

Most of the comments from the state agencies suggested that the proposed Order would duplicate existing processes and impose additional burdens on the state agencies, and urged that greater flexibility be granted to states.

The DOT Order reinforces considerations already embodied in NEPA and Title VI, and the final version has been revised to make this clearer. It is intended to insure that a process for the assessment of environmental justice factors becomes common practice in the application of those, and related, statutes.

Many other comments suggested ways in which the Order might be clarified or simplified, or addressed specific details of individual agency implementation. As this Order is only intended to provide general guidance to all DOT components, detailed comments on each agency's implementation are premature, and should be made during opportunities for public input on agency implementation (para. 5 of the Order).

Several commenters suggested greater reliance on existing procedures, particularly those implementing NEPA.

One commenter noted, "Over the past number of years we have seen rules and laws initiated with laudable intent, only to be slowly transformed into bureaucratic mazes only dimly related to their original purpose."

The Department does not intend that this Order be the first step in creating a new set of requirements. The objective of this Order is the development of a process.
that integrates the existing statutory and regulatory requirements in a manner that helps ensure that the interests and well being of minority populations and low-income populations are considered and addressed during transportation decision making.

To further advance this objective, explanatory information has been provided in this preamble and several changes have been made in the Order. Most notably:

--Further clarification has been provided concerning the use of existing NEPA, Title VI, URA and ISTEA planning requirements and procedures to satisfy the objectives of Executive Order 12898.

--The application of the Order to ongoing activities is discussed in this preamble.

--The Order has been modified to further clarify the relationship and use of NEPA and Title VI in implementing the Executive Order.

Further, in developing and reviewing implementing procedures, described in paragraph 5a to comply with Executive Order 12898, the emphasis continues to be on the actual implementation of NEPA, Title VI, the URA and ISTEA planning requirements so as to prevent disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of DOT's programs, policies and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

One of the primary issues raised in the proposed Order concerned the actions that would be taken if a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect on minority populations or low-income populations is identified. The proposed Order set forth three options. A variety of comments were received on this issue, both for and against the various options.

The final Order adopts a modified version of Option B from the proposed Order. While Option B implements a new process for addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects, the Department believes that Option B is consistent with existing law and best accomplishes the objectives of the Executive Order. Option B (now incorporated in paragraphs 8a, 8b and 8c of the final Order) provides that disproportionate impacts on low-income and minority populations are to be avoided, if practicable, that is, unless avoiding such disproportionate impacts would result in significant adverse impacts on other important social, economic, or environmental resources. Further, populations protected by Title VI are covered by the additional provisions of paragraph 8b. Three commenters expressed concern and uncertainty as to the implementation of paragraph 6b(1) of Option B as proposed, that provided for an agreement with populations protected by Title VI. DOT agreed with the comments and, accordingly, that paragraph has been deleted.
Several commenters asked about the effective date of this Order. In particular they wanted to know whether it applies to ongoing projects. The effective date of the Order is the date of its issuance. However, to the extent that the Order clarifies existing requirements that ensure environmental justice principles are considered and addressed before final transportation decisions are made, its purposes already should be reflected in actions relating to ongoing projects.

Several commenters recommended that insignificant or de minimis actions not be covered by this Order. It is noted that the definition of "programs, policies and/or activities" in Section 1f of the Appendix does not apply to those actions that do not affect human health or the environment. Other actions that have insignificant effects on human health or the environment can be excluded from coverage by a DOT component.

One commenter suggested that this Order might be inconsistent with the Supreme Court's decision in Adarand Constructors v. Pena. DOT has concluded that, since the purpose of this Order is unrelated to the types of programs which were the subject of Adarand, this Order is not affected by the Adarand decision.


Federico F. Pena,

Secretary of Transportation.

Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C.

Order

Subject: Department of Transportation Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

1. Purpose and Authority

a. This Order establishes procedures for the Department of Transportation (DOT) to use in complying with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, dated February 11, 1994. Relevant definitions are in the Appendix.
b. Executive Order 12898 requires each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, to achieve environmental justice as part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects, of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States. Compliance with this DOT Order is a key element in the environmental justice strategy adopted by DOT to implement the Executive Order, and can be achieved within the framework of existing laws, regulations, and guidance.

c. Consistent with paragraph 6-609 of Executive Order 12898, this Order is limited to improving the internal management of the Department and is not intended to, nor does it, create any rights, benefits, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity, by a party against the Department, its operating administrations, its officers, or any person. Nor should this Order be construed to create any right to judicial review involving the compliance or noncompliance with this Order by the Department, its operating administrations, its officers or any other person.

2. Scope This Order applies to the Office of the Secretary, the United States Coast Guard, DOT's operating administrations, and all other DOT components.

3. Effective Date This Order is effective upon its date of issuance.

4. Policy a. It is the policy of DOT to promote the principles of environmental justice (as embodied in the Executive Order) through the incorporation of those principles in all DOT programs, policies, and activities. This will be done by fully considering environmental justice principles throughout planning and decision-making processes in the development of programs, policies, and activities, using the principles of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, (URA), the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and other DOT statutes, regulations and guidance that address or affect infrastructure planning and decisionmaking; social, economic, or environmental matters; public health; and public involvement. b. In complying with this Order, DOT will rely upon existing authority to collect data and conduct research associated with environmental justice concerns. To the extent permitted by existing law, and whenever practical and appropriate to assure that disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low income populations are identified and addressed, DOT shall collect, maintain, and analyze information on the race, color, national origin, and income level of persons adversely affected by DOT programs, policies, and activities, and use such information in complying with this Order.
5. Integration With Existing Operations

a. The Office of the Secretary and each operating administration shall determine the most effective and efficient way of integrating the processes and objectives of this Order with their existing regulations and guidance. Within six months of the date of this Order each operating administration will provide a report to the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy and the Director of the Departmental Office of Civil Rights describing the procedures it has developed to integrate, or how it is integrating, the processes and objectives set forth in this Order into its operations.

b. In undertaking the integration with existing operations described in paragraph 5a, DOT shall observe the following principles:

(1) Planning and programming activities that have the potential to have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on human health or the environment shall include explicit consideration of the effects on minority populations and low-income populations. Procedures shall be established or expanded, as necessary, to provide meaningful opportunities for public involvement by members of minority populations and low-income populations during the planning and development of programs, policies, and activities (including the identification of potential effects, alternatives, and mitigation measures).

(2) Steps shall be taken to provide the public, including members of minority populations and low-income populations, access to public information concerning the human health or environmental impacts of programs, policies, and activities, including information that will address the concerns of minority and low-income populations regarding the health and environmental impacts of the proposed action.

c. Future rulemaking activities undertaken pursuant to DOT Order 2100.5 (which governs all DOT rulemaking), and the development of any future guidance or procedures for DOT programs, policies, or activities that affect human health or the environment, shall address compliance with Executive Order 12898 and this Order, as appropriate.

d. The formulation of future DOT policy statements and proposals for legislation which may affect human health or the environment will include consideration of the provisions of Executive Order 12898 and this Order.

6. Ongoing DOT Responsibility Compliance with Executive Order 12898 is an ongoing DOT responsibility. DOT will continuously monitor its programs, policies, and activities to ensure that disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and low-income populations are avoided, minimized or
mitigated in a manner consistent with this Order and Executive Order 12898. This Order does not alter existing assignments or delegations of authority to the Operating Administrations or other DOT components.

7. Preventing Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects

a. Under Title VI, each Federal agency is required to ensure that no person, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. This statute affects every program area in DOT. Consequently, DOT managers and staff must administer their programs in a manner to assure that no person is excluded from participating in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination by any program or activity of DOT because of race, color, or national origin.

b. It is DOT policy to actively administer and monitor its operations and decision making to assure that nondiscrimination is an integral part of its programs, policies, and activities. DOT currently administers policies, programs, and activities which are subject to the requirements of NEPA, Title VI, URA, ISTEA and other statutes that involve human health or environmental matters, or interrelated social and economic impacts. These requirements will be administered so as to identify, early in the development of the program, policy or activity, the risk of discrimination so that positive corrective action can be taken. In implementing these requirements, the following information should be obtained where relevant, appropriate and practical:

--Population served and/or affected by race, color or national origin, and income level;

--Proposed steps to guard against disproportionately high and adverse effects on persons on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

--Present and proposed membership by race, color, or national origin, in any planning or advisory body which is part of the program.

c. Statutes governing DOT operations will be administered so as to identify and avoid discrimination and avoid disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and low-income populations by:

(1) identifying and evaluating environmental, public health, and interrelated social and economic effects of DOT programs, policies and activities,

180
(2) proposing measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse environmental and public health effects and interrelated social and economic effects, and providing offsetting benefits and opportunities to enhance communities, neighborhoods, and individuals affected by DOT programs, policies and activities, where permitted by law and consistent with the Executive Order,

(3) considering alternatives to proposed programs, policies, and activities, where such alternatives would result in avoiding and/or minimizing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts, consistent with the Executive Order, and

(4) eliciting public involvement opportunities and considering the results thereof, including soliciting input from affected minority and low-income populations in considering alternatives.

8. Actions To Address Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects

a. Following the guidance set forth in this Order and its Appendix, the head of each Operating Administration and the responsible officials for other DOT components shall determine whether programs, policies, and activities for which they are responsible will have an adverse impact on minority and low-income populations and whether that adverse impact will be disproportionately high.

b. In making determinations regarding disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations, mitigation and enhancements measures that will be taken and all offsetting benefits to the affected minority and low-income populations may be taken into account, as well as the design, comparative impacts, and the relevant number of similar existing system elements in non-minority and non-low-income areas.

c. The Operating Administrators and other responsible DOT officials will ensure that any of their respective programs, policies or activities that will have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority populations or low-income populations will only be carried out if further mitigation measures or alternatives that would avoid or reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effect are not practicable. In determining whether a mitigation measure or an alternative is `practicable," the social, economic (including costs) and environmental effects of avoiding or mitigating the adverse effects will be taken into account.

d. Operating Administrators and other responsible DOT officials will also ensure that any of their respective programs, policies or activities that will have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on populations protected by Title VI ("protected populations") will only be carried out if:
(1) a substantial need for the program, policy or activity exists, based on the overall public interest; and

(2) alternatives that would have less adverse effects on protected populations (and that still satisfy the need identified in subparagraph (1) above), either (i) would have other adverse social, economic, environmental or human health impacts that are more severe, or (ii) would involve increased costs of extraordinary magnitude.

e. DOT's responsibilities under Title VI and related statutes and regulations are not limited by this paragraph, nor does this paragraph limit or preclude claims by individuals or groups of people with respect to any DOT programs, policies, or activities under these authorities. Nothing in this Order adds to or reduces existing Title VI due process mechanisms.

f. The findings, determinations and/or demonstration made in accordance with this section must be appropriately documented, normally in the environmental impact statement or other NEPA document prepared for the program, policy or activity, or in other appropriate planning or program documentation. Appendix 1. Definitions

The following terms where used in this Order shall have the following meanings *:

a. DOT means the Office of the Secretary, DOT operating administrations, and all other DOT components.

b. Low-Income means a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.

c. Minority means a person who is:

1) Black (a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa);

(2) Hispanic (a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race);

(3) Asian American (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands); or

(4) American Indian and Alaskan Native (a person having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition).

d. Low-Income Population means any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant,
geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

e. Minority Population means any readily identifiable groups of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

f. Adverse effects means the totality of significant individual or cumulative human health or environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects, which may include, but are not limited to: bodily impairment, infirmity, illness or death; air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination; destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources; destruction or diminution of aesthetic values; destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community's economic vitality; destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services; vibration; adverse employment effects; displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations; increased traffic congestion, isolation, exclusion or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community; and the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities.

g. Disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations means an adverse effect that:

(1) is predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population, or

(2) will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.

h. Programs, policies, and/or activities means all projects, programs, policies, and activities that affect human health or the environment, and which are undertaken or approved by DOT. These include, but are not limited to, permits, licenses, and financial assistance provided by DOT. Interrelated projects within a system may be considered to be a single project, program, policy or activity for purposes of this Order.

i. Regulations and guidance means regulations, programs, policies, guidance, and procedures promulgated, issued, or approved by DOT. * These definitions are intended to be consistent with the draft definitions for E.O. 12898 that have been
issued by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency. To the extent that these definitions vary from the CEQ and EPA draft definitions, they reflect further refinements deemed necessary to tailor the definitions to fit within the context of the DOT program.

Federico F. Pena,
Secretary of Transportation.
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DATA COLLECTION DIAGRAM

COLLEGE PARK STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Transportation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 53/88%</td>
<td>Fulton County: 42/70%</td>
<td>22-34: 26/43%</td>
<td>Male: 33/55%</td>
<td>Black: 54/90%</td>
<td>0-8,500: 24/40%</td>
<td>High School: 31/52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I encountered an elderly man at the College Park Station who was afraid to participate in the survey, because of his history with the MARTA police. He thought that I worked for MARTA and that if he participated, he would be arrested or he would lose his privilege to use MARTA.

FIVE POINTS STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Transportation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 57/95%</td>
<td>Fulton County: 50/83%</td>
<td>22-34: 18/30%</td>
<td>Female: 34/57%</td>
<td>Black: 50/83%</td>
<td>0-8,500: 26/43%</td>
<td>College: 32/53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KENNSINGTON STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Transportation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 49/82%</td>
<td>Dekalb County: 52/87%</td>
<td>22-34: 23/38%</td>
<td>Female: 33/55%</td>
<td>Black: 48/80%</td>
<td>0-8,500: 32/53%</td>
<td>High School: 29/48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were a lot of non traditional students using this Kensington Station to commute to the new location for Open Campus High School on Stone Mountain Industrial.

LINDBERGH STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Transportation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 52/87%</td>
<td>Fulton County: 46/77%</td>
<td>22-34: 20/33%</td>
<td>Male: 37/62%</td>
<td>Black: 42/70%</td>
<td>0-8,500: 18/30%</td>
<td>College: 30/50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were a lot of working professional that were in route to and from work. Many of the people I attempted to survey could not participate, because they were MARTA employees.
## WEST END STATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Transportation</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 50/83%</td>
<td>Fulton County: 57/95%</td>
<td>22-34: 25/42%</td>
<td>Female: 30/50%</td>
<td>Black: 58/97%</td>
<td>0-8,500: 28/47%</td>
<td>College: 37/62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were not a lot of AUC students surveyed at the West End Station.

## THE GEORGRAPHY OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

**MULTIMODAL TRANSPORT SYSTEM**

![Diagram of multimodal transport system]
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