**Part VII: Conclusions**

New tools, like Google’s Distance Matrix API web tool, make it possible to measure accessibility more accurately than ever before. With precise estimations of the amount of time it takes to drive, take transit, walk, or bike between any origin or destination, it is possible to accurate determine whether the people of any given city, region, or country can reasonably and affectively reach of the places that they need to go to carry out their daily lives. By knowing this information, it becomes to understand where transportation systems are performing at their best and where they warrant improvement, a vital task for planners, policy makers, and academics alike. Service inequities—where the provision of mobility services does not match the need or demand from citizens—can be elucidated, especially when they affect marginalized groups like the poor. Mapping these phenomena makes it possible to ensure that everyone—regardless of where they live—has the mobility assets (public or private) required to access the benefits associated with their own cities, no matter where in the world that they live.

This is especially true in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where there are substantial concerns that its urban poor, especially those living in the hundreds of precarious *asentamientos* scattered across its suburban periphery, are further marginalized by a transportation system that unfairly limits their access to key opportunity sites while promoting, and even encouraging, the mobility and subsequent accessibility of their fellow citizens. Cornered onto isolated pieces of land in response to hostile government housing policies and uneven economic growth, the provision of publicly-available transportation (and must for people far too poor to afford traditional housing, let alone private automobiles) has been insufficient, especially as funding for transit has been slashed and operations privatized. A victim of rapid motorization, the transit system has struggled to recover the loss of passengers to private automobiles; services, for both rail and bus, have shown few improvements, equipment old, vehicles crowded, and services unreliable. As transit, and its ability to enhance *accessibility*, have deteriorated for all, it is not unreasonable to expect those transport services provided to the *asentamientos*—nestled in Buenos Aires’ periphery with some of its most physically- and socioeconomically-disadvantage people—to be some of the conurbation’s worst.

Using Google’s data, this project tried to evaluate where these inequalities truly exist within the Buenos Aires agglomeration and, as seen above, many clearly do. After acquiring the data, which required querying the Distance Matrix API for estimations of the transit-based travel times between an assortment of origins and destinations (the former census geographies characterized by their spatial overlap with known asentamientos and the latter a series of ten activity sites determined to be important to *asentados*), I performed a series of difference-of-means tests to surmise whether these times were longer for those geographies with *asentamientos* than those without. Tabulated for *asentamientos* sampled from three of agglomerated Buenos Aires’ departments (each representing municipalities in different stages of urbanization), the statistics produced by the subsequent ANOVA and independent-means t-tests revealed that, while inequalities do exist within the study area, they vary by destination type and the urban morphology of each individual district.

Within Buenos Aires’ traditional core, where all of the departments are either fully urbanized (Quilmes) or mostly-urbanized (La Matanza), travel times are much longer for *asentamientos* when travelling by transit to major commercial and employment centers (central business districts), public hospitals, and railway stations (both part of the greater transportation system as well as local centers of commerce).

Nevertheless, these results rely on several major assumptions, some of which place these findings on more tenuous grounds. For one, there is no way to verify the accuracy of these findings; there are no reliable alternative methods for calculating these travel times (the downside to tool’s novelty) without being on the ground. Similarly, these results are entirely theoretical and based solely on the route schedules supplied as GTFS; they are unable to account for congestion, overcrowding, and other common delays associated with transit. In turn, most of these times are probably underestimations of actual travel times.
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To a similar point, I also am hesitant to make any concrete policy recommendations from these results alone.

I believe the economic and political conditions that surround the provision of transit in the peripheral areas of Buenos Aires are much more complex than I yet understand.

Simply recommending that routes be changed or that new modes of transit be introduced ignores the actual conditions on the ground.

Previous work has shown that transit politics in Argentina are extraordinarily complex, especially when looking across jurisdictions and they need to be fully considered before any realistic recommendations can be made; any serious policy recommendations needs to have a better initial grasp of these intricacies.

Nevertheless, the fact that a simplistic model like this still showed such a dramatic inequality of transit services between the core and periphery of metropolitan Buenos Aires seems to suggest that there are indeed larger problems of transit inequity that need to be fixed.