



## **WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

### **Improving job access in the US, France and the UK: examining the role of transport initiatives.**

**Sophie Tyler  
Karen Lucas**

School of Architecture and the Built Environment

This is an electronic version of a paper presented at the Annual European Transport Conference, 04-06 Oct 2004, Strasbourg, France. The Conference was organized by the Association for European Transport.

---

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners. Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

---

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch.  
(<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail [wattsn@wmin.ac.uk](mailto:wattsn@wmin.ac.uk).

# IMPROVING JOB ACCESS IN THE US, FRANCE AND THE UK: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF TRANSPORT INITIATIVES

Sophie Tyler and Karen Lucas  
Transport Studies Group, University of Westminster

This paper is based on a study currently underway to investigate the role of transport initiatives in improving access to training and employment opportunities in the US, France and the UK. The research particularly focuses on those experiencing or at risk of social exclusion. After an introduction to the background of the study, this paper first examines the policy frameworks established in each country relating to job access. Second, it presents a number of examples of job access initiatives which have been selected as case studies as part of the research. Finally, it presents the methodology chosen to analyse the efficiency and effectiveness of the initiatives and briefly highlights some preliminary results.

## 1. BACKGROUND

In 2002, the FIA Foundation for the Automobile and Society <sup>1</sup> commissioned the Transport Studies Group, University of Westminster to carry out a study to compare the positions of the (then) G7 countries in relation to transport and social exclusion. The three main objectives of this scoping stage were to:

- (i) Compare the extent and diversity of form of social exclusion across the seven countries and different national approaches to the problem;
- (ii) Examine the ways in which the transport policies of the seven countries recognise and alleviate - or accentuate - the problem;
- (iii) Identify innovative and transferable transport and non-transport policy driven initiatives that can contribute to more socially inclusive transport systems.

The study involved the drafting of seven national papers, one for each of the G7 members. A summary of the main findings of this scoping study was published by the FIA Foundation earlier this year (Lucas, 2004). The study concluded that although in all the countries, transport was recognised as an important basic need, there were marked differences in the ways in which the interaction between transport and social exclusion were researched and recognised at a policy level. For example, in Germany, there has been little debate as yet about transport and accessibility issues. In Italy and Japan, problems with accessibility are mainly seen in terms of the reduced mobility of elderly and disabled populations. In Canada, the concept of social exclusion is not widely known or understood and transport professionals usually refer to the term *basic mobility* when describing transport to good or services that are considered essential or of high social value. Similar issues are being addressed the US under the banner of *environmental justice*.

The scoping research highlighted that the US, France and the UK have the most longstanding policy agendas and practical programmes addressing the links between transport and social exclusion. In addition, all three countries have developed a number of initiatives focusing on the need to improve access to employment opportunities. In the US and the UK, these efforts have been part of a wider “welfare-to-work” agenda, whereas in France they are more often perceived as a contribution to enabling participation in mainstream society for those currently on it’s margins.

In the light of these findings, earlier this year, the FIA Foundation invited the Transport Studies Group to follow up the scoping study with a more detailed programme of research. This second phase, which is the subject of this paper, focuses on transport and travel initiatives to improve access to employment in the US, France and the UK. The twelve month study, which will conclude in December 2004, brings together researchers from the Transport Studies Group, the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Paris XII <sup>2</sup>.

The main aim of the study is to carry out a comparative *cost effectiveness* analysis of a range of subsidised transport initiatives aiming to improve access to employment and/or encourage job retention. This will be achieved through the detailed examination of five job access initiatives in each of the three countries participating in the study.

A preliminary phase of the research has involved trying to better understand the political and legislative frameworks governing these initiatives and the way in which they are linked to national policy agendas. A review of the welfare benefits relevant to those unemployed or on low wages was considered an essential precursor to meaningful analysis of the cost effectiveness of each individual initiative and subsequent comparative analysis of this. A summary of this preliminary phase is set out in more detail in the next section.

## **2. REVIEW OF POLICY, LEGISLATIVE AND FUNDING FRAMEWORKS**

### **2.1 The US**

The US has the longest history of specific transport initiatives targeting job access. This is against a background of generally lower levels of public transport provision and a more pronounced trend towards dispersed job locations than is evident in either the UK or France. High levels of car dependency are illustrated by data from the US Census Bureau (2000): approximately 130,000,000 people commute to work by car, (almost 50% of the population), with public transport only used about 5% of the time (Kennedy, 2003 p.3).

A parallel phenomenon is the increase in the number of jobs in the suburbs. Some 70% of all metropolitan job growth in the US between 1980 and 1990 took place outside central cities, with the majority of new manufacturing and trade sector jobs being created in the suburbs (Cervero et al., 2002 p. 5). Significant proportions of families living below the poverty level still live in central city areas, however, therefore there is a spatial mismatch between the

location of many entry-level jobs and where many of those on low incomes live (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Efforts have been made for 10 years or so to address the transport needs of low-income communities. Action in this area has largely been driven by federal policy to reduce the number of people receiving welfare benefits and to increase those in work. Facilitating “welfare to work” is an important tenant of federal welfare programmes, such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Programme, created in 1996 under the ‘Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation (PRWORA) Act.

Overseen by the Department for Health and Human Services (DHHS), each State is responsible for designing and developing their own TANF programme, with matched funding from their own budgets. For example, The TANF programme in California, where the US case studies are located, is called CalWORKS. Individual States are held accountable for ensuring that welfare payments are provided for the short term and that families move towards the goal of work and self-sufficiency. Penalties are levied by the DHHS for a variety of infringements. These include the failure by States to ensure that participants work “as soon as job ready or no later than two years after coming on assistance” or to enforce the rule that sets a time limit on a family receiving assistance to a cumulative total of 60 months (U.S. Department for Health and Human Services, 2004).

Promoting work and self-sufficiency are also the primary objectives of two other grant programmes, Welfare-to-Work (WtW), administered by the US Department of Labor and the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), administered by the US Federal Transit Administration (FTA). More recently the Executive Order on “Human Service Transportation Coordination” creates an “Interagency Transportation Coordination Council” to promote interagency cooperation on services for transport disadvantaged people, including those on low incomes (U.S. President Executive Order, 2004).

WtW aims to provide States with additional grant funding to develop job opportunities for the hardest to employ recipients of TANF. 85% of the grant must be allocated to local “Workforce Investment Boards”, to develop and implement job training programmes. The other 15% can be used to develop other welfare-to-work projects. These can include the creation of subsidised public sector jobs, community service, job retention and other support services. The latter can include some transport services (U.S. Department of Labor).

JARC provides grants to local government and non-profit organisations to develop transport services that specifically target assisting welfare recipients and low-income workers to access employment. The grants are provided on a 50/50 basis that is 50% of the total costs of the initiatives have to be provided by matched funding. Eligible projects include extending existing fixed route services or their hours of operation, shuttle buses, carpooling activities and local car loan programmes that assist individuals to buy and maintain cars for car pooling purposes. In 2002, the JARC programme allocated a total of

\$16765 367 to 76 projects across the US (U.S. Federal Transit Administration, 2002). The programme aims to supplement TANF and WtW, but significantly, is not restricted to assisting welfare recipients, thus making it possible for those who are not longer eligible for TANF to benefit.

Historically, the problem of linking welfare recipients with entry-level jobs was addressed on an individual level, by reimbursing their travel costs (whether for public transport trips or car mileage). The JARC approach is based on the recognition that reimbursement cannot solve the problem of job access when neither public transport services nor car ownership is an option.

## **2.2 France**

As in most advanced industrial societies, France is witnessing a growth in car usage. Some 70% of all commuting trips are made by car and most households own a car (82%) (Orfeuil, 2003 p.12). Recent research has also demonstrated that commuting journeys are getting longer; for example those living in urban areas travelled on average 13.3km in 1999, 1 km more than in 1990 (INSEE, 2001). This reflects the growing number of households living in urban areas and their suburbs, with the location of increasing number of workplaces moving to the edge of cities, often not served by public transport and therefore not accessible to those without a car (Orfeuil, 2003). The importance of the car for accessing work is illustrated by the findings of research carried out in deprived urban areas identified for particular state assistance. This found that, all other things being equal, having a driving license reduced the average time of being out of work by 23%, owning a car reduced the average time by 20% (Le Breton, 2004).

The share of journeys made by public transport in France is generally higher than in either the US or the UK<sup>3</sup> and in recent years, a number of urban areas have expanded their networks by introducing new tram systems<sup>4</sup> (GART, 2003). Funding arrangements also differ. French public transport has long enjoyed higher levels of subsidy. For example, figures for the late 1990s indicate that 48% of bus operating costs come from public subsidies or grants in France, compared to 32% in the UK (CPT, 2003). In addition, a large share of the funding for urban public transport networks is contributed by employers in the form of a transport tax (*versement de transport*). The rate varies according to the population of the urban area, but averages at about 1% of the net salary of each employee and amounts to approximately half of all public transport authorities income, excluding loans (GART, 2003 p. 7).

To date, initiatives which specifically address the mobility needs of job seekers or low income workers have been either very local or focused on fare reductions for existing public transport services. Examples of local initiatives include the setting up of car loan scheme targeted at job seekers in a rural area, a moped hire and training scheme for those who cannot afford to have driving lessons or own a car and a demand responsive bus service linking nearby neighbourhoods with the airport and surrounding employers at Roissy, near Paris (Le Breton, 2004).

Nationwide initiatives include extending public transport tariff reductions to job seekers and recipients of minimum income supplements (RMI) and local employment offices (ANPE) reimbursing the costs of travel to interviews, the costs of commuting to a job a long way from home or even the costs of moving home to be able to take up a job.

In 2001, a new national funding programme was launched by the French Ministry for Infrastructure, Transport, Housing, Tourism and the Sea to tackle transport and social exclusion in urban areas. “Mobilité urbaine pour tous” (*Urban mobility for all*) aims to support innovative transport schemes that link those living in deprived urban areas with the rest of the city. It is planned to help finance the running costs of 60 projects between 2002 and 2005 (Ministère de l'équipement, du transport et du logement, 2002). 16 projects were chosen in 2002, including extending existing lines to new business zones, demand responsive services, services during atypical hours (at night or weekends), car-pooling centres, car sharing and moped sharing schemes.

With the number of unemployed in France rising to 4 million, the Ministry for Employment, Work and Social Cohesion has recently published a ‘Social Cohesion Plan’ (Ministère de l'emploi, du travail, et de la cohésion sociale, 2004) <sup>5</sup>. This sets out a number of initiatives and new funding arrangements under three main pillars: Employment, Housing and Equality of Opportunity. In the area of employment, the Plan represents a move towards more focussed efforts to help unemployed individuals return to work through the allocation of personal advisors, training, apprenticeship and subsidised work schemes. In addition, more funding is promised to interim and intermediate employment associations, to assist them to enable more unemployed people to reach the goal of work or training. No specific mention is made in the plan of transport related initiatives. However, the emphasis on using welfare benefits as a lever towards encouraging those currently without jobs back into the labour market and on the need for more individual assistance suggests that transport issues may become more significant in the future.

### **2.3 UK**

Over the last four to five years, there has been growing awareness of the links between transport and social exclusion, in the context of increasing levels of car dependence, at the expense of those who rely on other modes in the UK. In the period 1999-2001, 63% of all trips were made by car, compared to 6% by bus, but one in four households still did not have access to a car. Even for households without a car, 17% of all trips were made by this mode in 1999-2001, compared to 51% on foot and 20% by public transport (UK Office for National Statistics, 2004).

In many areas, the last decade has witnessed a decline in public transport services, with lower frequency and reliability levels. Over 80% of bus services in England (outside London) are now provided by private operators (UK Department for Transport). Since the introduction of a deregulated market in local public transport in 1986, many services that are not commercially viable have been simply cut and fare levels have been increasing at a greater rate

than motoring costs (Lucas et al., 2001 p.7 &11). These factors have been compounded by many entry-level jobs being created in suburban locations, which are not well-served by public transport or involving working hours that make access difficult by any other means than a car (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003 p. 97).

Recent UK government research has highlighted the fact that transport problems are often a major barrier to accessing work; 13% of people in one study said that they have not applied for a particular job in the last 12 months due to transport problems (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003 p.10). Tackling problems with accessing job opportunities has, therefore, become an increasingly important policy objective in moving people from welfare into work.

In 2003, the UK Government's Social Exclusion Unit published a report focusing on transport. *Making the Connections* (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003), states the Government's commitment to addressing the transport barriers that prevent people accessing job opportunities. The approach adopted by the Government is based on the premise that wherever possible, those who are able to work should be enabled to do so. The SEU report outlines a several stage process:

- First to identify those seeking work and the areas in which they live;
- Second to identify job opportunities within a reasonable distance of those seeking work;
- Third to analyse gaps in accessibility to those opportunities;
- Fourth, to work in consultation with relevant stakeholders and delivery agencies (such as the employment and benefit services, 'Jobcentre Plus') as well as potential employers to develop interventions that best fill the accessibility "gap".

In addition to the emphasis put on making the transition from welfare into work, recent policy making has been largely driven by an accessibility planning approach for improving access to employment. The recently, published draft 'Guidance on Accessibility Planning in Local Transport Plans' (UK Department for Transport, 2004) sets out how local authorities, in partnership with other agencies should systematically assess whether workplaces, shopping facilities, local health, education and other services are accessible to their communities and then work together to develop solutions where particular unmet needs are identified.

In recent years, a number of policy and practical initiatives have been developed to improve job access. At a national level, these mostly target individuals and include a scheme to reimburse the costs of travelling to interviews, the creation of fund available to those advising job seekers to assist with other transport related expenses and the extension of public transport concessionary fares to some job seekers and new workers. As in the US, those in receipt of unemployment benefits (Jobseekers Allowance) are obliged to prove that they are actively seeking work. Moreover, government programmes, such as the "New Deal", which are compulsory for

some groups of unemployed people, aim to assist the transition back into work, through a combination of personal supervision, basic skills courses, subsidised employment places, full time training or further education <sup>6</sup>.

In addition to these nationwide schemes, a range of different national funding programmes support initiatives at the local level. These include regeneration funds (usually targeted at the most deprived areas), funds linked to the UK government “New Deal” welfare to work programme, rural transport schemes and grants specifically targeted at improving urban and rural bus services. Examples of local initiatives include fixed route bus services linking particular deprived communities with jobs and services, demand responsive bus services, moped loan schemes for job seekers and new workers, and personalised journey planning services.

In all three countries, very little research (if any, in the case of France and the UK) has been undertaken to better understand the real value of targeted transport initiatives in moving people from welfare into work or to assess the relative cost effectiveness of the different intervention types. A key aim of this project, therefore, is to develop an easy to use, replicable and transferable methodology based on readily available or easily collectable data at the project level to assess this. The main advantages of undertaking cross-country comparisons is that the influence of a wider range of policy scenarios can be considered and as well as a broader selection of project types.

### **3. EXAMPLES OF CASE STUDIES**

Five cases study projects have been selected for analysis in each of the three countries under examination in each of the three countries. They represent a range of different types of location (urban, rural, suburban), target groups and types of initiative (fixed route and demand responsive public transport, information and training, car and moped loan services). Given the constraints of this paper, it is not possible to discuss all fifteen case studies, and so three examples are set out below, one each from the US, France and the UK to give a flavour of the different types of initiative involved.

#### **3.1 Yolo County, California – Route 215**

Yolo County is a small, mainly rural country located to the north east of San Francisco, west of Sacramento. The case study focuses on one particular bus route, which links the city of Woodland, where a large proportion of the county’s CalWORKs <sup>7</sup> participants live, with the Cache Creek Casino, located on a Indian reservation, 23 miles out of the city.

Route 215 is the result of a joint study carried out in the late 1990s by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and the primary bus operator in the county, Yolobus. The study identified that a new route to the casino would serve to link low-income communities, not just in Woodland, but also in a number of small towns along the route. At the same time, the County Department of Employment and Social Services (DESS), in charge of



administering the new CalWORKS programme, was given the responsibility to ensure that as many of their clients as possible made a successful transition from welfare to work.

The Cache Creek Casino expanded in 1998, creating a large number of entry-level jobs. However, with existing staff having difficulties accessing the site due to non-existent public transport, the employers were facing considerable recruitment and retention problems. They were therefore prepared to help finance the new route.

The new route is partly financed by JARC funding, with the remainder coming from the Casino owners, the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians. Since it started service in July 2000, the route has been regarded as very successful. The bus timetable is coordinated with workers shift patterns and Route 215 runs all day and night, seven days of the week.

### **3.2 Ile-de-France – ‘Abeille aide et entraide’ demand responsive service**

In France, a significant amount of the work carried out with deprived communities or the unemployed is delegated by the relevant government agencies (Ministère de l'emploi, du travail, et de la cohésion sociale and Délégation interministérielle à la ville <sup>8</sup>) to associations specialising in social care, intermediate employment and basic skills training. They have the task of reintegrating into society, those who are experiencing the greatest difficulties in doing so. “Abeille aide et entraide” is one such association, located in one of the most remote suburbs south of Paris. It provides a demand responsive service supported through contracts both with the national government and the ‘Department of Essonne’ (regional government). The association’s 1400 clients include those who have been unemployed for more than 3 years, those whose sole income is from the national minimum income guarantee scheme (RMI) and lone parents.

The service relies on two eight-seater minibuses, four drivers and a computer to organise the trip itinerary. It is currently available to members of the association, for short journeys within a large area from 6.30am on Mondays to 7.30pm on Sundays. In 2003, 1127 trips (57575km) were made with a total of 3944 passengers. Most of these trips were for work or training purposes. Due to its success, it is now in the process of becoming a fully professional service, which will enable it open its services to those outside the association membership, with a view to achieving a better occupancy rate.

### **3.3 Shropshire – Wheels to Work**

Shropshire is one of the largest counties in England, bordering Wales to the west, Cheshire and Staffordshire to the northeast, Worcestershire and Herefordshire to the south and the industrial heartland of the West Midlands (Wolverhampton, Birmingham) to the east. It is a largely rural county, with few

towns of any size, particularly in the south. Wheels to Work (W2W) was originally established in South Shropshire and North Herefordshire via the then Rural Development Commission's (RDC) Countryside Employment Programme (CEP) in 1995. In addition to support from the RDC, funding has also been provided by both County Councils, South Shropshire and Leominster District Councils and the two Training and Enterprise Councils.

In 1999, the project was extended to cover the whole of Shropshire, supported by the newly created government body, the Countryside Agency, Shropshire County Council, South Shropshire District Council and the Training and Enterprise Council, with new funding provided by the other District and Borough Councils in the county. This funding package only provided for basic operational costs of the project officer and thus further funding was obtained from the National Lottery Charities Board (now the Community Fund) in 1999.

The project originally aimed to loan mopeds, primarily to young people (16 – 25), to help them access employment and training opportunities. The loan usually lasts 6 to 9 months and participants are asked to contribute £10 per month to the costs. To be eligible for W2W, potential participants must either have an offer of full time training or employment, or be currently employed and require assistance to help retain their current post. The vast majority of participants are referred to Wheels to Work from agencies such as Jobcentre Plus, the careers & training advice service for young people, Connexions and other training agencies.

From 1999 until earlier this year, the project provided not only moped loans, but also subsidised driving lessons. Bicycles loans and a fund for small grants of up to £150 for minor vehicle repairs was also set up, which are still available.

Figures from the project's database show that there were a total of 1175 referrals between January 2000 and April 2004. The majority of these were young people between the ages of 16 and 25, however, a small number of people taking part in the New Deal 25+ programmes were also referred. Participants are only selected if there is no other feasible transport option available to them (e.g. bus or rail service) and if they are considered to be unable to afford their own vehicle. Since 2000, 119 have been allocated a moped and 93 have been provided with vouchers for driving lessons.

## **4. METHODOLOGY AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS**

### **4.1 Methodology**

One of the greatest challenges for the study has been to develop a realistic and appropriate methodology capable of evaluating the cost effectiveness of such a variety of initiatives. An additional constraint was that the analysis would need to be based on the data that was likely to be already available within projects or easily collectable through some additional, ad hoc, small scale surveys.

Most of the initiatives included as case studies are non-profit making and due to the nature of the people they assist, cannot expect to receive a significant contribution to their costs from users or passengers. All are in receipt of national or local government funding, even if it is only to assist with the start up costs and first few months of operation. One of the main aims of the study was, therefore, to develop a framework, which could enable the costs to the state of supporting an initiative to be compared with the costs of providing unemployment benefit payments that might otherwise be incurred if the initiative didn't exist.

This involves a three stage process: First, to establish whether there is any link between initiative and the number of its users in training or in work; second, to look at the costs of providing the initiative, its outputs and the costs of relevant welfare benefits; third, to examine any other 'quality of life' benefits of the initiative (e.g. on family life, childcare, community building) through the use of qualitative data.

With this process in mind, it was decided that for each case, the following categories of data should be collected:

- Objectives – what the initiative aims to achieve;
- Inputs – the funding required to set up and run the initiative, as well as any revenue;
- Outputs – daily miles of services per bus, number of passengers per week;
- Outcomes – degree to which objectives are met, cost-effectiveness.

The following table sets out the three last categories in more detail and gives examples of data collected from the Shropshire Wheels to Work scheme for the 2003-2004 financial year.

**Table 1: Data Categories**

<b>Data Category</b>	<b>Data-Subcategory</b>	<b>Shropshire W2W e.g.</b>
Inputs:	National public sector grant	Countryside Agency
	Local public sector grant	Shropshire County Council, Bridgenorth Rural TP, North Shropshire DC, Oswestry BC, Shrewsbury & Atcham BC, Market Drayton Town Grant, Whitchurch Market Town Grant Learning and Skills Council New Deal Client Funding
	Public sector subsidy	N/a
	Charity grant	Community Fund
	Private sector / employer contribution	N/a
	Fare / user revenue	Tyre maintenance (£10 per month per user)

<b>Data Category</b>	<b>Data-Subcategory</b>	<b>Shropshire W2W e.g.</b>
Outputs:	Miles / km driven	N/a
	Length of route	N/a
	Patronage / number of users	Moped users = 36; Driving lesson vouchers = 11
	Number of vehicles available / capacity	Moped Fleet - 42
Outcomes:		
Cost effectiveness	Cost per person (per month)	Capital Costs: Office set up (computers etc.) moped fleet Revenue Costs: salaries, Rent, office running costs, office consumables, administrative support from CCS Vehicle Costs: insurance, maintenance, CBT (training), helmet, reflective belt, road license, recovery & breakdown Divided by Number of moped user months in 2003-4 & number of driving lesson clients
	Cost per passenger trip	N/a
	Cost per vehicle mile / km	N/a
	Cost per hour of operation	N/a
Relating to objectives	% passengers / users accessing new jobs / training places	Proportion of total number of users for 2003-4 accessing new jobs and training places
	% passengers / users retaining employment	Proportion of total number of users for 2003-4 enabled to retain employment by W2W
	average weekly income from take home earnings (using initiative)	National Minimum Wage for young people 18-21 (37 hours a week x £3.80 = £140.60 OR Modern Apprenticeship Weekly Wage = approx. £80 per week
	average weekly income if unemployed	Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) £43.25 per week
	Average weekly cost to state if unemployed	Weekly JSA, housing benefit, and council tax benefit
	Actual weekly savings to state (compared to paying taxi costs)	Cost of taxi trip versus cost per week with initiative (based on real examples)
	Quality of life impacts	Quotes from questionnaires and telephone interviews

## **4.2 Preliminary results for the Shropshire Wheels to Work case study**

Preliminary results suggest that the scheme has a major impact in assisting those who would otherwise be unable to access job or training opportunities. Analysis of the scheme's database recording each referral from 2000 – 2004 demonstrate how young people are only accepted to either loan a moped or receive vouchers for subsidized driving lessons if there is no other alternative transport option available or if they are dependent on a short term solution which could be withdrawn at any moment.

The cost effectiveness of the scheme has not yet been proven using the financial data collected. Early examinations of real examples of trips to work or college made by W2W participants highlight the often considerable distances involved (some in excess of 20 miles). In addition, the cost of undertaking even short trips, by private hire vehicles (in most cases the only other feasible option to W2W) would amount to between £50 and £200 a week, depending on whether the home destination is a long way from the base of the private hire company. Even where a monthly contract had been signed between a local training provider and a private hire firm, the cost of transporting a young person to their training place can cost up to £700 per month.

In comparison, a rough calculation based on revenue costs for W2W in the financial year 2003-04 would suggest that a per capita spend would be in the region of £200 per month.

## **4.3 Conclusions**

Very little research has been undertaken to understand the real value of targeted transport initiatives in moving people from welfare into work or to assess the relative cost effectiveness of the different intervention types. Funded schemes are notoriously poorly monitored, in all three countries and there is no systematically applied method for making cost:benefit comparisons between schemes or between different policy conditions. Clearly at this stage of the study, the evidence upon which to make recommendations about which transport interventions might prove the most cost effective in assisting people from welfare into work is incomplete. Detailed analysis of data from the fifteen case studies will enable a better understanding of the efficiency and effectiveness of job access initiatives, as well as an insight into the quality of life benefits they may bring for their users.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> For more details about the FIA Foundation and its programmes see <http://www.fiafoundation.com>

<sup>2</sup> The researchers are the paper's authors, as well as Professor Robert Cervero (Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California) and Professor Jean-Pierre Orfeuill, (Centre de Recherche sur l'Espace, les Transports, l'Environnement et les Institutions Locales', University of Paris XII)

<sup>3</sup> Public transport accounts for 9% of all trips in France and 15% of all commuting trips (1994 National Travel Survey)

<sup>4</sup> 23 urban areas have a new tram system or have an accepted plan to develop one.

<sup>5</sup> In some deprived urban areas, unemployment amongst young people between 16 and 24 has reached 50%, compared to 28% 15 years ago.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.newdeal.gov.uk>

<sup>7</sup> CalWORKS or 'California Work Opportunity and Responsibilities to Kids' is the Californian State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programme (see section 2.1)

<sup>8</sup> Ministry of Employment, Work and Social Cohesion and the Interministerial Delegation for Urban Affairs

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cervero, R. Tsai, Y.-H., Wachs, M. Deakin, E. Dibb, J., Kluter, A., Nuworsoo, C., Petrova, I, Pohan, M.R. (2002) *Reverse Commuting and Job Access in California : Markets, Needs and Policy Prospects*, California Department of Transportation, September 2002

CPT - The Confederation of Passenger Transport UK, (February 2003) *Facts 2003* <http://www.cpt-uk.org>

GART- Le Groupement des autorités responsables de transport (2003) *Les chiffres de référence des transports publics*, <http://www.gart.org>

INSEE - Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques, France (2001), *Les déplacements domicile-travail* INSEE Premiere No 767 April 2001. <http://www.insee.fr>

Kennedy, L. (2003) *Transport and Social Exclusion: a United States View*, Paper presented at an Experts' Seminar, University of Westminster, London, 4 April 2003

Le Breton, E. (2004) *Nouveaux problèmes de mobilité, nouveaux acteurs? L'aide à la mobilité dans le secteur de l'insertion sociale et professionnelle*, Institut pour la Ville en Mouvement, Paris (forthcoming)

Lucas, K. (2004) *Transport & Social Exclusion: A survey of the Group of Seven nations*, FIA Foundation, London.

Lucas, K., Grosvenor, T. & Simpson, R. (2001) *Transport, the Environment and social exclusion*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

Ministère de l'emploi, du travail, et de la cohésion sociale (2004) *Plan de Cohésion Sociale*, <http://www.cohesionsociale.gouv.fr/>

Ministère de l'équipement, du transport et du logement - Ministère délégué à la ville (2002), *Mobilité urbaine pour tous : programme pour le développement du service public de transport en faveur des territoires prioritaires de la politique de la ville*, Paris, April 2002. <http://i.ville.gouv.fr/>

Orfeuill, J.P. (2003) *Transport and Social Exclusion: a G7 comparison, mobility, poverty and exclusion in France*, Paper presented at an Experts' Seminar, University of Westminster, London, 4 April 2003

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion*, <http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk>

U.S. Census Bureau (2000), *Table GCT-P14. Income and Poverty in 1999: 2000*, Census 2000 Summary File 4, <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html>

U.S. Department for Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (2004), *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Fact Sheet*, 5 May 2004, <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/fact/tanf.html>

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment & Training Administration (undated), *Welfare-to-Work Grants Fact Sheet*, <http://www.doleta.gov/wtw/resources/fact-grant/cfm>

U.S. Federal Transit Administration (2002), *Job Access And Reverse Commute Program Announcement Of Program Selection*, Number 67 67236 11-04-02  
[http://www.fta.dot.gov/legal/federal\\_register/2002/278\\_1446\\_ENG\\_HTML.htm](http://www.fta.dot.gov/legal/federal_register/2002/278_1446_ENG_HTML.htm)

U.S. President Executive Order (2004), *Human Service Transportation Coordination*, 24 February 2004, <http://whitehouse.gov>

UK Department for Transport (2004), *Guidance on Accessibility Planning in Local Transport Plans*, Draft for Consultation, 4 August 2004, <http://www.dft.gov.uk>

UK Department for Transport (undated) *Local bus services in England: an overview*, <http://www.dft.gov.uk>

UK Office for National Statistics (2004) *Social Trends 34: 2004 Edition*, <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/>