Equity conceptualizations and standards within transportation literature: a scoping review

# Introduction

An equitable transportation system from a transportation planning perspective, is broadly defined as the fair production, distribution, and reproduction of transportation benefits, and costs within a community (R. H. M. Pereira, Schwanen, and Banister 2017; Sheller 2018; R. H. M. Pereira and Karner 2021). Transportation equity is a multi-scale and multi-dimensional topic, which focuses on how transport-related benefits and burdens are distributed across population groups and communities within urban, suburban or rural areas. Benefits and burdens can include, but are not limited to, accessibility, mobility, affordability, health and environmental issues that impact individuals, marginalized members of a community, and the community as a whole (Lucas et al. 2019).

Transportation systems are complex: they support multi-modal uses and are home to emerging new technologies and service modes that complicating the benefit and burden tensions for transport users (Guo et al. 2020). As a result of these tensions and variety of potential uses of transport systems, an *equitable* system is not a positivist attribute; it must be normatively (morally) defined by a community or broader society before or during the process of measurement and operationalization (R. H. M. Pereira and Karner 2021; Páez, Scott, and Morency 2012). Both academic literature and planners are grappling to contextualize what an equitable transportation system may look like along spatial, temporal, environmental, and socio-economical dimensions (Boisjoly and El-Geneidy 2017; R. H. M. Pereira and Karner 2021). Synthesizing methods on how to define, measure, and operationalize transportation equity is urgently needed as planners and decision-makers are undecided on how to distribute existing transportation resources and simultaneously invest in future transportation infrastructure *fairly*.

The application of equity within the realm of transportation planning has proliferated in the academic literature but concrete adoption of the concepts in planning practice has been minimal (R. H. M. Pereira and Karner 2021; Boisjoly and El-Geneidy 2017; Doran, El-Geneidy, and Manaugh 2021; Linovski 2020; Litman 2022). Academic literature has approached equity through measures such as accessibility and activity participation (Páez, Scott, and Morency 2012; Allen and Farber 2020), affordability (Isalou, Litman, and Shahmoradi 2014), environmental impacts and safety (Guo et al. 2020), and health (Fransen et al. 2015; M. Smith et al. 2017), and also conceptualizations such as frameworks for equity and social exclusion (Lucas 2006; Lucas et al. 2016), and distributive justice theories (Behbahani et al. 2019; Lewis, MacKenzie, and Kaminsky 2021; R. H. M. Pereira, Schwanen, and Banister 2017; Vecchio and Martens 2021), among others. However, what is missing from the literature is a comprehensive review of the academic literature from the lens of how equity is conceptualized, theorized and operationalized through measures and standards. These questions are vital to planning agencies and decision-makers, and as such, this review aims to definitively benchmark the knowledge in the literature from this perspective.

Though aspects of transport equity in metropolitan planning documents such as accessibility (Boisjoly and El-Geneidy 2017) or mode-specific equity (Doran, El-Geneidy, and Manaugh 2021) have been reviewed, no review to date captures how equity has been theorized and translated into standards from the perspective of equity dimensions. Our work contributes in this direction, reviewing which equity dimensions, standards, and conceptualizations have been applied in the academic literature and identifying where gaps exist in the literature. Ultimately, this review aims to collate the academic knowledge and present it in an operationalizable manner to both academics and decision-makers in hopes to catalyze the uptake in equitable planning practices and guide future research programmes which develop definitions, measures, and recommendations for evaluating transportation equity.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we set the stage by defining what do we mean by equity dimensions, conceptualizations and types of standards used in the literature search and throughout the paper. In Section 3, we outline the methods used in the scoping review conducted. In Section 4, we summarize the high-level findings of the literature. In Section 5, we discuss the standards and conceptualizations along with how they connect to dimensions and measures more specifically. In Section 6, we summarize the findings and link them to future transport planning agendas in addition to visioning ways the findings can be used to build *just* transportation planning processes.

# Setting the stage

Transportation equity literature exists within cross-cutting categories. We borrow a “Where?”, “When?”, “Who?”, “What?”, and “How?” framing to categorize aspects of how equity is assessed. This categorization is outlined in Jaggar (2009) to describe substantive sets of answers to questions of distributive justice (and further discussed in the context of justice within the critical human geography discipline (Przybylinski 2022)). For questions of *justice*, convincing answers to these questions require a rationale, a “Why?” (Jaggar 2009). For the purpose of this review of *equity* however, studies that substantively answer “Why?” may be included but are included as a result of addressing where, when, who, what, and how. That being said, answers to “Why?” are critical, but are not as common, and this next step in planning for *justice* transportation literature is discussed in Section 6.

It is important to distinguish between equity and justice. The focus of this paper is on transport equity, which is nested within and can be interpreted as the application of justice theories. For instance, *mobility justice* seeks to understand how broader power inequities inform the governance and control of movement are reproduced by mobility systems(Sheller 2018); in understanding what is *just* and *unjust,* equity is application of processes to move towards justice. What is justice should be decided locally and democratically - it can be interpreted as the utopian goal of equity processes.

### Definitions

For all literature reviewed in the transportation domain, equity *dimensions*, *conceptualizations*, and *standards* are discussed through the “Where?”, “When?”, “Who?”, “What?”, and “How?” framings. As follows, we define what each of these categories mean within this review and how they inter-connect.

**Equity dimensions**: transportation equity can be assessed across multiple dimensions which can be broadly distinguished as (1) mobility/accessibility, (2) traffic-related pollution, (4) traffic safety, and (4) health as provided in a conceptual framework provided by (Lucas et al. 2019). All papers reviewed include dimensions that cover the “What?” of the transport equity issue and can be further disaggregated across the following broad considerations:

* *What*: includes the equity dimensions (i.e., mobility/accessibility, traffic-related pollution, traffic safety, or health).
* *Who* and *When*: includes the type of population group, mode type, activity/opportunity type, transport network status, and temporal scope of the study.
* *Where*: includes the geographic areas of the study (urban, suburban and rural areas, countries).
* *How*: includes the measure used to assess equity dimensions (i.e., mobility/accessibility measures, traffic-related pollution measures, traffic safety measures, or health measures).

**Equity conceptualizations**: in addition to including equity dimension(s), all studies have equity conceptualization(s). This includes some type of equity principle, philosophy or theory that motivate the study. Examples of these conceptualizations are broadly defined as follows:

* Theoretical and conceptual frameworks (e.g., transport-related social exclusion, transport disadvantage, transport poverty, horizontal equity, vertical equity, among others)
* Theories of justice (e.g., distributive justice, spatial justice, environmental justice, procedural justice, restorative justice, among others)
* Equity principles (typically related to theories of distributive justice as it the most commonly) (e.g., Rawl’s egalitarism, Utilitarism, Capabilities Approach, Sufficientarism)

**Equity standards**: lastly, in addition to dimensions and conceptualizations, all studies reviewed include equity standard(s). These standards should be a thresholds of some sort that when operationalized can be used to define when an aspect of the transportation system is equitable (or just), not equitable (or unjust), or somewhere in-between. These standards can be broadly summarized as quantitative thresholds, qualitative descriptions, and mixed-method thresholds and are highly dependent on the type of equity dimension and conceptualization adopted in the study. Types of equity standards can broadly include:

* Maximum travel distance/cost/time to or from key places or activities
* Maximum exposure to externalities (i.e., exposure to noise or air pollution)
* Distribution assessment (e.g., composite indicator, range, maximum distance or gap, etc.)
* Satisfaction or dissatisfaction;
  + With travel to and from activities, or
  + From externalities related to transportation systems

Together, studies that include equity dimensions, conceptualizations and standards should provide substantive answers to the “Where?”, “When?”, “Who?”, “What?”, and “How?” as it relates to defining equity within the context of transportation systems (i.e., the users, the infrastructure, the service, the outcomes, or a combination of all). The aim of this review is to answer the following questions:

* What are the equity dimensions, equity standards, and equity conceptualizations and how are they applied in the existing transportation equity academic literature?
* Based on how equity has been applied in the literature, what may be paths forward in theorizing justice in the context of transportation systems?

# Literature review methods

This review follows the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) approach to the conduct of scoping reviews which encompasses enhancements of the Arksey and O’Malley (2005) framework (Peters et al. 2020). The JBI is a global organization that creates frameworks, protocols and guidance for the synthesis of research. This review is also guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR) which is congruent with the JBI approach (Tricco et al. 2018). We examine the breadth and depth of the academic literature on transportation equity that analyses equity within at least one dimensions and implements equity conceptualizations and equity standards as defined in the previous section. Using the selected synthesis method allows this review to explore the broad topic of transportation equity within the literature and collate knowledge from across methodologies in the academic literature.

The primary research question and the protocol was drafted and refined from the preliminary searches and consultations with the authorship team who are engaged in transportation equity related research (Iglesias et al. 2019; Sagaris, Berrios, and Tiznado-Aitken 2020; Vecchio and Martens 2021) and a University of Toronto Research Services Librarian and Liaison Librarian in City Studies. The methods are described in two parts: (i) the development of the search strategy and (ii) the evidence selection and data extraction process.

## Search strategy

A multi-platform search strategy was developed by the authors along with consultation of knowledge synthesis experts as described in this section.

First, to guide the conceptual search strategy and the selection of search terms within the search query, **inclusion** and **exclusion** criteria were developed (Peters et al. 2020). For the inclusion criteria, the mnemonic PCC (population, concept, and context) was adopted (see Appendix [Figure 7](#fig-A1): for details).

Next, the inclusion and exclusion criteria was applied to develop the search strategy. The search strategy was developed iteratively, at each stage adding topic search terms (e.g., terms in the title, abstract or key words) to the set of terms tied together with logical connector terms “AND” and “OR”. These stages are summarized in what follows and the full search term queries are detailed in Appendix [Figure 7](#fig-A1) .

1. An initial limited search of the core collections within the Web of Science (WoS) platform was undertaken to identify key articles and evidence. Terms for ‘transportation’ and ‘equity’ were generated, respectively. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, the index terms used to describe the articles, and subject heading searches when available (depending on the database within WoS). This search was iterated on and and initially took the general form: (“Transport” OR “Transit” OR “Car\*” OR “Walk” OR “Bike”…**1**) AND (“Equity” OR “Justice” OR “Equity” OR “Fair”…**2**), where **1** and **2** signify additional related terms that related to ‘transportation’ and ‘equity’, respectively.
2. Upon inspection of the preliminary search results and authorship team consensus, the ‘equity’ set of search terms was expanded into three sets of terms. The first describing equity theories, the second describing equity dimensions, and the third describing terms referring to standards. All three sets of terms were iteratively added to as done in the first stage. The finalized search query takes the following general form: (“Transport” OR “Transit” OR “Car\*” OR “Walk” OR “Bike”…**1**) AND (“Equity” OR “Justice” OR “Equity” OR “Fair”…**2**) AND (“Accessibility” OR “Mobility” OR …3) AND (“Standard” OR “Threshold” OR …4) where **1**,**2**,**3**, and **4** signify additional related terms included in the sets combined with “OR” logical connectors.

The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, were as consistently applied to each database and platform searched (Web of Science General Collection -Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index (Web of Science), and Transportation Research International Documentation (TRID)). The exports of the final search query was completed by the lead researcher on March 21st 2021.

## Evidence selection and data extraction

Evidence selection consists of scanning the records from the search strategy and retaining the ones that fit the inclusion and exclusion criteria. This process was pilot-tested with a subset of records before being implemented on the full set of records. Additionally, *Covidence*, an online application that facilities screening and data extraction, was used for all steps.

1. The first step (orange box in [Figure 1](#fig-fig1)) included screening all titles and abstracts of records on whether they included transportation equity as defined by the PCC. All records were voted on by two independent reviewers for inclusion, exclusion, or uncertain inclusion. All uncertain records, conflicting records, and records missing abstracts were voted on by a third reviewer for inclusion or exclusion.
2. The second step (green box in [Figure 1](#fig-fig1)) included reviewing all full-text records which passed step 1. These records were reviewed based on if their study design included an equity standard and equity conceptualization. All records are voted on by two independent reviewers for inclusion or exclusion. If an article was voted to be excluded, it was tagged with one of five possible reasons, namely (1) no standards included, (2) no conceptualizations included, (3) no standard and no conceptualization included, (4) send back – QA issue, (5) other. Discrepancies were resolved by a third reviewer.
3. A data extraction template was filled out for each record: one reviewer for the third and final step (purple box in [Figure 1](#fig-fig1)). The data extraction template was created as a balance between complexity of categories and simplicity of summary; information related to “What?” (equity dimension), “Who?” (population group, mode type, type of destination/activity), “Where?” (region of study), “How?” (how the record measured equity standards), and “What?” (what is the equity standard(s) and associated conceptualization(s)) was filled out for each study. [Figure 8](#fig-A2) contains the template that was input into *Covidence* and used within this literature review.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 1: Evidence selection process framework. Step 1 (orange) is title and abstract screening, step 2 (green) is full-text review, and step 3 (purple) is data extraction. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 2: PRISMA flow diagram for the evidence selection process. ES signifies equity standard and EC signifies equity conceptualization. |

The evidence selection process is reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram (Page et al. 2021) in [Figure 2](#fig-fig2). Note, 487 records entered step 3 (purple) but only 166 records remained. Applying the data extraction template by the reviewers (authorship team) in step 3 revealed that inclusion was too generous, and records often did not have a sufficiently strong equity standard and/or equity conceptualization.

# Summary of findings

<!- NOTE: in this section, only papers that are included in the review (i.e., have a full template) are cited. -->

A synthesis of the findings from the data extraction records created using the template in [Figure 8](#fig-A2) for each of the 166 included papers is detailed in this section. Of note, the presentation of this synthesis is less granular than the template in order to highlight key trends.

## Journal publications throughout the years

[Figure 3](#fig-fig3) displays the papers included in this review by year of publication and case study continent. Of note is the geographic scope of the case studies present in the papers. The majority of papers (60%) contain case studies based in the Global North e.g., North America (particularly USA and Canada), Europe (particularly UK, France, Spain and Scanadianvia), and Oceania (Australia and New Zealand). How *equity* is operationalized is context specific, and with the majority of transportation systems *not* in the Global North, the literature included in this review falls short in representing the global perspective.

The few studies in the Global South are predominately in the **Asian** continent, specifically China but also India, Thailand, South Korean, Iran, Philippines, Indonesia, Israel, and Japan. These studies focus on a variety of modes, population groups, and equity conceptualizations and standards that cannot be succinctly summarized. The next most common continent within the Global South literature examines cases in **South America**. Many of these studies mention a systematic absence of evidence relevant to the region (Vecchio, Tiznado-Aitken, and Hurtubia 2020). For instance, even when the links between transport development, social exclusion, and poverty have been increasingly recognized in the literature [Benevenuto and Caulfield (2020)), Brazilian studies show that the social dimension of transport has been continuously neglected at the planning stage [Benevenuto and Caulfield (2020); Boisjoly et al. (2020) ). Examining region-specific transport equity concerns in South America is also highlighted within the literature, such as affordability as one of the main mobility barriers in the region [Falavigna and Hernandez (2016); Rivas et al. (2021)) or analyzing multi-dimensional mobility inequalities such as public transport accessibility and quality of walking environments [Tiznado-Aitken, Munoz, and Hurtubia (2018)).

Studies focusing on **Africa** are even more sparse than South America. A commonality between the studies is the absence of official data (Fried et al., 2020) and the application of external policy guidelines. Also, these studies acknowledge the use of informal transportation options and the pressures to development ‘hard’ road network infrastructure (thus supporting car dependency) over meeting mobility/accessibility needs of citizens (Thondoo et al. 2020). As such, they compile databases based on open and georeferenced data, calculate objective and/or subjective measures (for example, Berhe, Martinez, and Verplanke (2014)), and focus on advancing transport justice from the perspective of low to medium-income countries (LMIC) applying external policy guidelines such as the Sustainability Development Goals (SDG) related to universal accessibility (Fried et al. 2020).

From all the studies included in the review, 85% focus on the urban and suburban context and are highly varied in their research aims. To give just one example, from the perspective of cycling as a mode, Cox and Bartle (2020) qualitatively examines cycling as a mode for people with disability in a typical mid-size town in the UK, and Ampe et al. (2020) identifies the lateral clearance that motorists should maintain when passing cyclists with children seats. Even when both focus on understanding barriers to cycling, they do it from different perspectiveswithin urban environments.

The remainder of the studies focus on rural regions (15%). To illustrate examples, Cao and Stanley (2017) examined transportation disadvantage in remote places which rely on inter-island ferry trips in the rural Philippines. Similarly, Parry et al. (2018) studied remote communities in the Amazonian and suggested that “increasing accessibility through road building would be maladaptive, exposing marginalized people to further harm and exacerbating climatic change by driving deforestation” (pp. 125).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 3: Papers included in the review by year of publication and case study continent. |

## Populations of interest

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4: The porportion of papers that investiage each type of population group. Categories for modes and population groups were generated upon data extraction. Reminder, NEED TO MOVE -OTHER- CATEGORY TO THE BOTTOM. |

<!- focus on income groups -->

[Figure 4](#fig-fig4) displays the population focus of the reviewed papers. We can see that most papers focus on how transport-related equity dimensions impact income groups within the population differently. Most papers focus on how those with the lowest incomes experience the greatest burdens of transport inequalities be it accessibility, affordability, or other dimensions (e.g., Falavigna and Hernandez (2016)).

The reviewed literature focuses on income because there is an abundant amount of work that suggests low levels of household income is a significant determinant of transport-related inequities (e.g., access to public transport supply in Bangkok region (Thailand) (Peungnumsai et al. 2020), access to employment opportunities in various cities in Brazil (Boisjoly et al. 2020), and less environmental noise, air, and higher green space per resident ratios in Rijnmond region (Netherlands) (Kruize et al. 2007)). But this should be kept in context, as low-income doesn’t necessarily mean low transport-related benefits. For instance, in Sheffield (UK) (Mears et al. 2019) show that historically working-class neighbourhoods (i.e., lower-income working population) have more access to green space than other neighbourhoods as a result of reactive urban planning approaches during the Victorian-era, but the quality of green spaces are less than average. Similarly, Bertrand, Therien, and Cloutier (2008) finds that lower-income groups do not always have below average accessibility depending on the granularity of analysis (i.e., the distance-to-food threshold for the cumulative opportunity measure).

<!- focus on age groups-->

Age is also a significant factor studied. Many of these papers highlight the differing age-related capabilities; for instance, (Martinez-Jimenez and Salinas-Perez 2019) and (Arranz-Lopez, Soria-Lara, and Pueyo-Campos 2019) identify travel distance/time to various opportunities for specific age-groups based on the recognition that the needs and preferences for accessing opportunities is age-group specific. Many of these age-related papers focus specifically on school-aged children, analyzing wellbeing (Laszkiewicz and Sikorska 2020), exposure to green space (Corazza et al. 2020), access to schools (Sharma and Patil 2022), and understanding (Mehdizadeh, Mamdoohi, and Nordfjaern 2017) and encouraging active travel (Mackie (2009)]. Another significant group of papers focus on older populations. These papers usually have similar aims as the children-focused papers but with a focus on elders e.g., understanding transport-related impacts on wellbeing (e.g, (Y. Chen et al. 2020)), measuring accessibility (e.g. (Cheng et al. 2019)), and seeking to understand *how to better* meet travel needs (e.g., (Nordbakke and Schwanen 2015) ).

<!- composite vulnerability, and other cross tabulations?- ->

The third most common approach taken in the reviewed literature uses a composite vulnerability index which seeks to capture the multi-dimensionality of population vulnerability. These efforts are informed by policy-generated measures of deprivation or author-informed census data creation, reflecting the diversity of methods to calculating vulnerability from an intersectionality approach. For instance, (Awuor and Melles 2019) uses the Neighbourhood Equity Index (NEI) to disparities in premature death in Toronto (Canada). The NEI is a composite index that was developed by the city to capture the differences in the City’s neighbourhoods by ranking them based on socio-economic characteristics (e.g., social assistance, unemployment, income) and physical environmental characteristics such as green space availability.

Other works used social and housing deprivation from the national census in Buenos Aires (Argentia) to create an Unsatisfied Basic Needs (NBI) index (Pucci et al. 2019) or measuring risk of transport poverty using census household poverty measures and accessibility indicators (Sun and Thakuriah 2021). Similarly, Environmental Justice (EJ) indicators have been used in US literature to identify neighbourhoods that have a higher than average proportion of low-income and non-white populations: using differing EJ definitions, literature has used EJ analysis to evaluate the equity impacts of transportation projects (e.g., (Rowangould, Karner, and London 2016; K. Park et al. 2021; Reddy, Chennadu, and Lu 2010) ).

<!- (Dis)ability, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Employment, Education level... the only focus -->

An exclusive focus on (dis)abilities (e.g., (J. Park et al. 2017; Chiscano 2021; Orellana et al. 2020) ) is relatively common in the reviewed literature (around 10%) mainly assessing universal design guidelines and the ability for people with (dis)abilities to travel. An exclusive focus on gender or race/ethnicity is much less common in the reviewed literature. For instance, only two articles exclusively focus on gender by exploring differences in cycling/active transportation ((Adlakha and Parra 2020) in Chennai (India) and Cardiff (UK) (Xie and Spinney 2018) ). Moreover, two articles focused on race/ethnicity exclusively focusing on how minority ethnicity communities are in proximity to green space (Silva et al. 2018) and culturally diverse family physicians in Toronto (Canada) (Wang and Roisman 2011). Furthermore, articles that focus *solely* on education level or employment level are not present in the reviewed articles: articles that feature these classifications typically investigate many other socio-economic and demographic categories, and therefore are classified under the composite vulnerability indexes

<!- the ‘other’ classification, cross tabulations?- ->

Finally, *Other* category group papers that include population characteristics that are harder to classify such as veterans and healthcare access (Mooney et al. 2000), pregnant people and access to services (Vadrevu and Kanjilal 2016), or youth populations who live in foster care (Batsche and Reader 2012) . Overall, the diversity of the *Other* population group classification demonstrates the diversity of transportation-equity concerns across population groups in the reviewed literature and the interplay of characteristics in the literature (Vecchio et al. 2022).

## Transport modes

<!- switching focus now to mode, especially transit. -->

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 5: The porportion of papers that investiage each type of mode. Categories for modes were generated upon data extraction. |

Papers included in our review focus primarily on public transport ([Figure 5](#fig-fig5) ), covering a wide variety of topics. For instance: (McKey, Kim, and Seo 2020) identify ‘food deserts’ in Dallas (USA) considering public transit accessibility. Other contributions intersect public transport and indivudal needs, such as, universal design and barrier-free transportation for people with disabilities in Spain (Jiménez-Espada and González-Escobar 2021) and China (Liu et al. 2019) or how can public transport can be improved for people with autism in Singapore (Lim et al. 2021). Typically, there is a strong focus on public passenger transport systems *because* it can be altered to improve equity - it is a collective social system that has the potential to be sufficiently funded in order to provide barrier-free transport for most. However, it alsorequires a variety of built environment and urban form conditions in order to operate that cannot always be met (e.g., sufficient density as a result of land-use, economic development, political will).

Transit is often central to multi-modal or holistic comparisons that may serve transport equity analysis. As an example, Brussel et al. (2019) compares three different approaches to measure accessibility in context to the Sustainability Development Goals (11.2) for the case of Bogota (Colombia), all of which capture some/all of the public transit system while others capture the road and/or pedestrian systems. From a different perspective, Renne and Mayorga (2018) reviews natural disaster emergency evacuation plans from the lens of the no-car (and oftentimes vulnerable) households in regions across the USA, paying particular attention to transit and pedestrian networks.

In contrast, a few papers in the reviewed literature frame transit modes as the ‘car-free’ option and compare transit to car access. This framing is notable as car travel is sometimes seen as a direct competitor to transit or benchmark for travel times and accessibility levels (Golub and Martens 2014; Martens, Golub, and Robinson 2012). As an example, Warren et al. (2015) develops a goal for per capita car ownership for the developing economy of Havana (Cuba), in recognition that car mobility is needed to alliviate transportation disadvantage in the short-term where public transit is not yet sufficiently addressed. In this context, this paper acknowledges the tension between household vulnerability and their need for mobility against sustainability goals of GHG emission reduction and car-dependency cycles. However, not all papers see transit as a direct competitor, but as a mode that can be used to satisfy individual capabilities. For instance, N. Smith, Hirsch, and Davis (2012) focuses on households who live in rural areas in the UK and they synthesis their perspectives on their minimum transport needs and costs based on perceived minimum living standards for types of households (e.g., retired, no-children, with children, single, etc.). The papers reviewed vary in the importance they place on climate urgency, with some focusing more on satisfying *all* sufficient individual needs while planning for less car-dependent cities in the future.

<!- Pedestrian is then the second most common -->

After transit, pedestrian modes is then the second most common focus. In the reviewed papers that focus exclusively on walking, many use or develop walkability scores to explore neighborhood perceptions (Evans 2015) or pedestrian mobility focusing on middle-aged and older adults (Towne et al. 2016), gender (Kim et al. 2016), or urban peripheries (Blecic et al. 2021). These papers use ‘walkability’ as a way to measure the equity in its distribution. Other papers use walkability as an indicator for public health and urban vitality (Sung and Lee 2015; McCormack et al. 2012).

Additionally, papers that focus on the pedestrian mode also often focus on multiple modes: they often discuss ‘walkability’ as part of active transportation, which focuses on both walking and bicycle and/or transit. Conceptualizations include how active transport contributes to children’s physical activity levels (Mammen et al. 2014), walkability as an alternative to car predominance (Bertrand, Therien, and Cloutier 2008) or tension that exists between modes, creating unsafe conditions for walking (Siu 2019; Ferenchak and Marshall 2019).

Cars are infrequently the only mode within a paper that is studied. When it is studied, the car mode is often used as a comparison with transit or as the only mode of transport for areas with sub-standard transit systems (e.g., (Kimmel et al. 2018; Aljoufie 2016) ). Similarly, car studies focus on externalities such as air pollution and safety (Tao Feng and Timmermans 2014; Houston et al. 2006).

## Destinations

<!- Finally, let’s talk destinations-->

The majority of the papers do not focus on any particular destination (e.g., 28% of studies). Within these papers, a variety of equity dimensions and modes are examined. Typically, they are multi-modal and focus on either dimensions that impact the **trip itself** (e.g., the trip itself, the quality of infrastructure, aspects of level of service) or the **people and relevant destinations that can be accessed** (e.g., a bundle of trips made for specific population groups, enough for ‘sufficient’ quality of life). For the first, the focus is on the quality of infrastructure, safety issues, perceived accessibility and dimensions of the level of service such as frequency (Zhe et al. 2008; Prasertsubpakij and Nitivattananon 2012; Fürst, Vogelauer, and Association for European Transport (AET) 2013 ; Lattman, Friman, and Olsson 2016). For the second, the focus is a bundle of trips made for specific population groups, such as people who are physically impaired (Wilkinson-Meyers et al. 2015) or women (Russell et al. 2021) or broadly what is enough for ‘sufficient’ quality of life (Churchill and Smyth 2019). These papers further demonstrate the multi-dimensional role of transportation systems: they provide a utilitarian service that can be used to get from A to B but they are also experienced by the people that use them. The papers that examine ‘all trips’ best exemplify this trend in the transportation equity literature.

In terms of the papers that study specific destination, the most commonly studied activity type includes employment healthcare services (15%) followed by a focus on healthcare services (11%). Papers that exclusively focus on employment typically focus on these trips as they are the most common trip purpose, generally speaking, and are often correlated with other trip activities like shops, recreation, and other services. For instance, Allen and Farber (2019) operationalizes a low employment-based accessibility threshold and composite population vulnerability index to identify neighborhoods in transport poverty for eight cities in Canada. Papers that exclusively focus on health care typically originate from the healthcare planning literature, and look to help inform planners where disparities in services exist and what can be done about it. For instance, Wang and Roisman (2011) models access of the Chinese-language speaking population in Toronto (Canada) to Mandarin-speaking family physicians and suggests (inferred by the authors) that a spatial mismatch in the supply and demand is not equitable.. Papers focused on healthcare and employment typically source data from representative travel surveys/diaries, census data, and point-of-interest databases: they often rely on well-developed and institutional data that represents ‘typical trips’, especially in the Global North where this data is more readily available.

But what about non-healthcare and non-employment activity types? Papers that focus on other activities are not framed as a ‘typical travel pattern’ and they have different intentions. For instance, papers that focus on places for shopping such as grocery stores or markets (12%), often aim to identifying food deserts (e.g., Choi and Suzuki (2013) ). Papers that focus on educational facilities including primary school, secondary school, and post-secondary school 11% of the studies are often in context of children’s active transportation to school (e.g., Laszkiewicz and Sikorska (2020) ) but also related to post-secondary educational facilities and their design and built environment (e.g., Larkins, Dunning, and Ridout (2011)).

When green space or other places of leisure is the sole focus (11%), papers focus on an accessibility dimensions across a variety of conceptualizations but which are ultimately considered with the spatial distribution of green space (e.g., Xu et al. (2017) ), for whom (e.g., Mavoa et al. (2015) ), and why (e.g., Mears et al. (2019) ). Very few papers include community ( including public service centres, places of community support, and places of worship (6% of studies) or childcare activity types (3% of studies), and when they are studied, they are typically included in a holistic representation of activity participation from an intersectional perspective (Alberts, Pfeffer, and Baud 2016; N. Smith, Hirsch, and Davis 2012)

Conclusions and recommendations from the papers are varied: they span across population groups, modes, and activity types – in addition to across equity dimensions, conceptualizations, as we exemplify below.

## Methods used across equity conceptualizations and standards

In this subsection, we discuss trends in the methods used within equity conceptualizations and standards. *Equity conceptualizations* that are present in the papers are grouped and defined as follows:

A) Equity conceptualizations, associated definition, and presence in the reviewed literature.

| Type | Brief definition | Presence |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Utilitarian | Maximizing benefits/welfare overall, without consideration of distribution. | 10.6% |
| Emerging approaches | E.g., **Sufficientarism**: minimums informed by individual capabilities. **Capabilities** **approach**: the capability of living the life they value rather than simply having the right to do so | 17% |
| Rights | Concerning legal rights or human rights to access (e.g., mobilty rights, rights to the city, discriminatory application of laws). | 9% |
| Inequitable externalities | Concerning the equitable distribution of externalities from transport systems (e.g., road safety, congestion, pollution). | 11% |
| Horizontal equity | The distribution of transport system benefits/costs should be equal across the population. | 11% |
| Vertical equity | The distribution of transport system benefits/costs should favourably prioritize disadvantaged groups. | 17% |
| Spatial equity | The distribution of transport system benefits/costs should be equal across space. | 16% |
| Well-being | Evaluation of transport system benefits/costs through well-being measures (e.g., livability, quality of life, subjective well being). | 17% |
| Transport-related exclusions | Concerning the links between transport system interaction and social exclusions. | 17% |

*Equity standards* types are summarized as follows:

B) Equity standards, associated definitions, and presence in the reviewed literature

| Type | Examples | Presence |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Environmental + | E.g., noise, air, pollution criteria, safety. | 4% |
| Infrastructure | E.g., Level of service of bus infrastructure, quality of cycling infrastructure, universal design standards. | 23% |
| Opportunity | An access to destination indicator value (e.g., number of opportunities within 30-min transit trip, a ratio of opportunity per population) or the use of travel impedance (the cost,distance or time thresholds e.g., 300m to bus stop). | 37% |
| Population | Related to population that uses or could use the transport systems (e.g., transport-related affordability level, perceived equitable trip, user experiences). | 36% |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6: The proportion of equity standards (x-axis) within each conceptualization (y-axis) . |

<!- what conceptualizations occur in papers with opportunity standards? what types of methods? -->

Broadly summarizing how equity standards explicitly connect with conceptualizations, some trends emerge in methods used. **Opportunity** and **population** standards appear in the literature at similar proportions ( 37% vs. 36%), but frequently correspond to different conceptualizations. Referring to [Figure 6](#fig-fig6), it can be seen that over 40% of papers that focus on **horizontal equity** and **spatial equity** conceptualizations suggest **opportunity** standards. Papers that use conceptualizations about horizontal equity and spatial equity often suggest travel impedance standards (a type of opportunity standard) and implement accessibility indices (i.e., a measure of the potential to interact with opportunities for populations located at each spatial unit within a region). Examples include: Z. Chen and Haynes (2017) (a high-speed rail trip from one municipality to another of four hours or less is considered comfortably connected), Yenisetty and Bahadure (2020) (a trip to a public transit stop from a spatial unit in a locality should be 1200m or less), and Shen et al. (2020) (disparities in populations accessing hospitals within 1 hour or less by car). They often employ disparity analysis through a variety of quantitative approaches such as Lorenz curves, spatial descriptive analysis, and the comparison to benchmarks (e.g., equal supply to demand of public transit in a spatial unit as done in Peungnumsai et al. (2020)) to determine which locations are spatially and horizontally (in)equitable relative to other locations in the studied region. These measurements can bring some challenges and pitfalls, as recently summarized by Karner, Pereira & Farber (2023). These papers are seldom use solely qualitative methods.

<!- what conceptualizations occur in papers with population standards? what types of methods? -->

Whereas, papers that propose **population** standards frequently utilize other methods. Over 40% of papers that suggest **population** standards focus on **well-being** conceptualizations (referring to [Figure 6](#fig-fig6) ). These papers typically ask *what is enough to lead a satisfactory life (as related to transportation)*, and the standards that are suggested include population benchmarks for comparison such as: questionnaires and relative comparisons to physical activity per week recommendations (Adlakha and Parra 2020; Auchincloss et al. 2020; McCormack et al. 2012; Kim et al. 2016; Towne et al. 2016), summative per capita benchmarks (e.g., energy consumption for a ‘decent living’ is suggested in (Rao and Baer 2012), and region-relative comparisons in health-related outcomes (e.g., premature mortality rates (Awuor and Melles 2019), spatial access to hospitals (R. Pereira et al. 2021), spatial access to supermarkets, active-mode-usage, and Body Mass Index (BMI) (Murphy et al. 2017)). The majority of these papers use quantitative/mixed-methods to identify inequities in **wellbeing**, however, a minority do use exclusively qualitative methods to distill themes (e.g. the exploration of *perceived* quality of life in (Berhe, Martinez, and Verplanke 2014)).

<!- what conceptualizations occur in papers that conceptualize BOTH population and opportunity standards? what types of methods? -->

Papers that conceptualize *both* **population** and **opportunity** standards often conceptualize **vertical equity** and **transport-related social exclusion** (note the similar proportions in these standards in [Figure 6](#fig-fig6) ). Expectedly, these articles often include a combination of methods. Questionnaires and other qualitative methods related to population standards and quantitative methods such as accessibility indices for opportunity standards are usually deployed. For instance, census data and the estimated proportion of households within travel distance/time/availability to/of key destinations is used to identify a variety of social exclusions (e.g., (Titheridge, Solomon, and Accessibility and User Needs in Transport for Sustainable Urban Environments Consortium (AUNT-SUE) 2008; W. Chen 2010; Daniels, MULLEY, and University of Sydney 2011; Sun and Thakuriah 2021 )), transport-related social exclusion’s link to wellbeing (e.g., (Delbosc and Currie 2011; Churchill and Smyth 2019)) areas more likely to experience transport poverty (Allen and Farber 2019), food deserts (McKey, Kim, and Seo 2020), or transport-related energy poverty (Robinson and Mattioli 2020; Berry et al. 2016; Berry 2019). Similar to papers that conceptualize **wellbeing**, the majority of **social-exclusion**-conceptualizing papers use quantitative/mixed-methods to identify areas, households, and/or populations at risk. The minority that employs exclusively qualitative methods use surveys to understand population travel willingness/barriers ( e.g., (W. Chen 2010; Mehdizadeh, Mamdoohi, and Nordfjaern 2017) ) and interviews/focus groups related to topics of unmet activity needs (Nordbakke and Schwanen 2015).

<!- what conceptualizations occur in papers that conceptualize infrastructure standards? what types of methods? -->

42% of papers that conceptualize equity with a focus in **Rights** suggest **Infrastructure** standards. Recall, **Infrastructure**-standards suggesting papers represents 37% of all papers and **Rights-**conceptualization is represented two times more than any other conceptualization type. These papers often focus on populations with mobility impairments and non-car users’ inequities in their ability to access the transportation systems. Methods vary, but focus equally on audits of existing infrastructure relative to best-practice universal design principles (Odeck, Hagen, and Fearnley 2010; Larkins, Dunning, and Ridout 2011; Jiménez-Espada and González-Escobar 2021; Perez-delHoyo et al. 2021), qualitative methods that interview/survey users about their perceived access to transport systems ( e.g., (Marquez, Poveda, and Vega 2019; Mateo-Babiano, Kumar, and Mejia 2017; Fürst, Vogelauer, and Association for European Transport (AET) 2013; Velho et al. 2016; J. Park et al. 2017; Lim et al. 2021) ) and experiments to test the suitability of existing best practice standards (e.g., (Daamen, de Boer, and de Kloe 2008; Velho et al. 2016; Bharathy and D’Souza 2018) ).

<!- what conceptualizations occur in papers that conceptualize Environmental+ standards? what types of methods? -->

Though papers that conceptualize **Environmental +** standards are not common in the literature review (4% of all papers), they most frequently occur in papers focused on **Inequitable externalities**. These papers often use traffic-related air pollution, noise pollution, green-space, urban design elements, urban air temperature, health related outcome, and physical activity guidelines to quantify transport-related externalities (Carrier et al. 2014; Mueller et al. 2018; Khomenko et al. 2020; Jephcote and Chen 2013; Corazza et al. 2020; Iungman et al. 2021; Apparicio et al. 2021; T. Feng and Zhang 2014; Kruize et al. 2007). Methods used are almost all quantitative or mixed-methods, and the identification in inequalities is spatial descriptive descriptions, spatial clustering, and/or use of Gini coefficent.

<!- NOTE: Overall, I’m having issues with this subsection and the following subsection. I don’t think this subsection is unique enough; maybe more discussion of the quant methods (like inequLITY MEASURES? poverty measures?) is needed? Maybe some additional discussion of other concept/standard mixes are needed? I also haven’t talked about utilitarian/emerging theories yet.

Further, I am unsure how to connect ‘equity dimensions’ to this discussion and/or how to use the tables in the following sub-section (i do agree, we can eventually move them to the appendix.

Also, maybe a table of frequent ranges in accessibility travel time thresholds should be created? Another a table with externalities limits (e.g., noise pollution) is needed- or perhaps I should briefly put them into the text?- ->

## Equity conceptualizations and standards across dimensions

In this section, we discuss trends in equity conceptualizations and standards across equity dimensions. These trends describe the “What”, “Who”, “When”, “Where”, and “How” across mobility/accessibility, traffic-related pollution, traffic safety, and/or health topics in the reviewed literature. See tables in the appendix (currently below) for detailed examples on a sample of studies.

##### **Dimension 1: mobility/accessibility**

From a large proportion of studies, the focus on mobility/accessibility equity dimensions is a focus on *affordability* and *population standards*. Examples….

* Though context specific (case study, population group, conceptualization type), many papers suggest travel distances to certain destination types. Here are a few examples, e.g., XX
* Additionally, some studies suggest travel times. The range from XXX, e.g., XXX. They use planning documents or guidelines related to accessibility

Equity dimension 1: mobility/accessibility

| Continent | Equity conceptualizations | Standard |
| --- | --- | --- |
| South America (select cities) - | Analyses how affordable urban public transportation is in select Latin American and Caribbean countries. They look at the assumed average monthly cost of urban transit trips and average monthly household income and conceptualize **transportation-related** **affordability**, especially for the most economically vulnerable (**vertical equity**). | **Population** **standards**: The financial burden of a basket of urban public transportation trips (60 trip fares, representing 30 round-trips per month) should not exceed 10% of household monthly income. |
| North America (USA - National) - | This study designed a web-based tool and took a representative sample of wheeled mobility device (WhMD) users anthropometry measurements to determine if the minimum standard suggested by the ADA is sufficient. We understand this conceptualization as a type of **Rights** conceptualization that WhMD should have minimum clear floor space (as described the guidelines in line with the American Disabilities Act) to access bus shelters, bus stop pads, and transit terminals. | **Infrastructure** **standard**: The clear floor area for wheelchairs: 760 mm (30 in.) wide by 1220 mm (48 in.) in length as described by the ADA standards. Notable, is that this minimum clear floor area is insufficient for a variety of the WhMD users. |
| Europe (Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmo cities in Sweden) - | Investigates what the literature and planning process is missing when we measure accessibility by comparing objective and self-reported accounts of accessibility among older people. This paper conceptualizes accessibility as from the position of the **capabilities approach** and **vertical equity** (particularly acknowledging that older people have capabilities that differ from the general population). | **Population** **and** **Opportunity** **standards**. Specifically for older populations (aged 65+), the following travel distances are suggested as equitable trip lengths to grocery stores per mode: Walking: less than or equal to 1500m, Combined public transit and walking (less than or equal to 1000m (walking element)), Combined car and walking: less than or equal to 1000m less than or equal to 1000m (walking element)), Bicycle: less than or equal to 3000m in addition to travel time threshold of less than 15 mins. |
| Asia (Yogyakarta, Indonesia) - | Spatial Preference Modelling for equitable infrastructure provision: an application of Sens Capability Approach. Conceptualizes equity through Sens **Capabilities Approach** and **spatial equity.** | **Opportunity** **standards**: Areas below the relative poverty line (of its neighbours) can only be located transport resources (i.e., measure in person\*kms that can be travelled at car speed, i.e., mobility) based on the following 2 benchmarks (they can be considered, together as the floor/minmum access): 1) Global: standard deviation (SD) distance to mean should be minimized. 2) Local: priority to minimise the differences with its neighbourhood |
| North America - | This paper conceptualizies equity in the multimodal network (transit, car) being fair toll-pricing across differences in populatins value of time (VOT). VOT is determined based on household income, with lower income households having lower VOT and thus deserving of lower tolls (**vertical equity***)*. From this perspective, a **utilitarian** perspective that seeks to minimize multimodal traffic congestion through introducing toll-pricing based on VOT is implemented. | **Infrastructure** **standard**: They demonstrate that a toll-pricing scheme based on individuals travel value-of-time (lower income people have a lower VOT) is equitable. |

##### Dimension 2: environmental pollution

Population standards i.e., thresholds associated with *who* is suffering an inequity, are often suggested. There are a few papers that use various air quality standards related to transport-population as minimum thresholds, e.g., XXX

* There are many papers that define travel thresholds based on emergency medicine, e.g., XX
* There are a few papers that use the PA threshold of 150 minutes a week, e.g., XXXX

Equity dimension 2: traffic related pollution/environmental externalities

| Continent | Equity conceptualizations | Standards |
| --- | --- | --- |
| North America (Montreal, Canada) - | This work examines the statistical association between different social groups and the concentration of air pollutants. They frame their work from the perspective of environmental equity but we interpret the conceptualizations to be along the lines of **inequitable externalities**, **spatial** and **vertical equity -** transport-related air pollution is a product of road transport and it impacts the air of residents in unequal spatial ways. The paper then frames this impact as unfair, particularly from the perspective of disproportionately disadvantaged residents. | **Infrastructure** **standards**: The literature suggests that the health implications from the transport-related air pollution from major roadways is most acute at residential distance locations of 200 m or less. Residential locations should not be located within this distance threshold from the perspective of human health. **Environmental+** and **Population** standards: Uses the WHO NO2 threshold as a point of comparison (annual concentrations of NO2 should not exceed 40 μg/m-3). They argue that even through no neighbourhood, even those disproportionately low income, exceed the WHO limit in this case study, they still suggest that air pollution should not be disproportionately impacting disadvantaged neighbourhoods. It can be interpreted that they use the WHO threshold as a minimum threshold and suggest that air pollution levels should not be impacting disadvantaged populations disproportionately ( a relative population standard) |
| Europe (Leicester, UK) - | Geospatial analysis of naturally occurring boundaries in road-transport emissions and childrens respiratory health across a demographically diverse cityscape. Emperically identifies at what distance away from major roadways children are most impacted by transport-related pollution. This is framed in the perspective of childrens **well-being.** Children are at most risk for acute respiratory distress from elevated levels of air pollution, and as such planning should consider this point of public health. | **Infrastructure** **standard**: Finds that children (most vulnerable to air pollution - related to motoized traffic) are most impacted by air pollution within 283 m of a road way. This should be the distance threshold that schools and other childrens facilities are located. |

##### Dimension 3: health

The health dimension shows established and robust approaches compared to mobility/accessibility. Standards for physical activity, emissions, and health burdens were recurrent in our review, usually tied to planning guidelines from global organisms, NGOs, or public organizations. For example, …

In addition to the table, other equity dimension health related papers that discuss…. Auchincloss et al. (2020) discusses the introduction of a bikeshare program and how it impacts physical activity levels of low-income users, specifically if low-income populations meet the WHO guidelines of physical activity per week (150 min or more of moderate intensity, or 75 min or more of vigorous intensity excluding walking, or an equivalent combination of the two).

* There are many papers that define travel thresholds based on emergency medicine, e.g., XX
* There are a few papers that use the PA threshold of 150 minutes a week, e.g., XXXX

Equity dimension 3: health

Continent

Equity conceptualizations

Standards

Asia (Chennai, India) -

From the perspective of gender equity in physical activity, focuses on womens cycling.

Population standards: All people should get 150 min of moderate activity a week or 75 min of vigorous physical activity per week.

Africa (Select urban and rural regions in Uganda) -

The well-being of mothers, this paper examines the timely access to emergency obsteric and newborn care for child-bearing aged women (vertical equity) in Uganda.

Opportunity standard: 2 hours to the nearest facility with surgical capacity with anesthesia services - this threshold is determined through the onset of bleeding to death if a women with obstetric hemorrhage does not receive adequate treatment).

Europe (Madrid and Barcelona, Spain) -

They use environmental pollution guidelines, but from the position of health. They investigate the impact of urban and transport planning on attributable mortality burden in Madrid and Barcelona and its distribution by socioeconomic status . Pre-mature mortality is not fair as a result of inequitable exposure to externalities pollution and motorized vehicles contribute to this. They should not be impacting people disproportionately (vertical equity) and should be even across space (spatial equity).

Environmental+ standards: All minimum threshold, if exceeded this is inequitable:

NO2 concentration 40 ug/m3

PM 2.5 concentration 10 ug/m3,

Noise 53dB for average 24 hours,

Living with 300 m crow-flies distance from at least .5 hectares of greenspace,

Change of air temperature of at least 1 \*C. an urban context in Ch.

They advocate for all people achieving physical activity thresholds (horizontal equity) but prioritize women and especially women in neighborhoods with low-walkability and socio-economic status (vertical equity).

Asia (Rasht, Iran) -

From the perspective of childrens wellbeing, assesses the walking time to school for children. They frame all walking to school as health, and as such conduct a survey to assess how long children walk to school so this time can be used for planning purposes.

Opportunity and Population standard: perceived walking time to school for students aged 7-9 yrs is 10 mins, and the longer the PWTS the less likely they were to use an active mode to travel to school

Oceania (Melbourne, Australia) -

Assesses the relationship between supermarket access and transport mode used, the BMI of the mode-user (wellbeing) and the equity in access distribution by income (vertical equity).

Opportunity and Population standards: all households should be sufficiently active (greater than 150 min and at least 5 sessions) and households should be within 1 km euclidean distance to supermarket (80-90% of the dwellings should meet this). Planners should prioritize socially disadvantaged areas to meeting these standards first.

: Equity dimension 3: health

##### Dimension 4: transport-related safety dimensions

Transport-related safety papers discuss…

* ds
* ds

Equity dimension 4: transport-related safety

| Continent | Equity conceptualizations | Standards |
| --- | --- | --- |
| North America (Denver, USA) - Ferenchak and Marshall (2019) | This paper, Equity Analysis of Proactively- vs. Reactively-Identified Traffic Safety Issues. From the perspective of **Spatial equity**; **Vertical equity**; **Inequitable exposure to externalities.** | **Infrastructure** and **Population** standards: 1) the lower the road collisions (observed safety, per capita crashes with pedestrians/cyclists), the better. No/minimal inequalities for general population vs. equity seeking groups (high proportion of POC and/or low income in tract). 2) the lower the perceived safety, the better (i.e., if travel to school by ped or bike is unsafe due to traffic conditions). No/minimal inequalities for general population vs. equity seeking groups (high proportion of POC and/or low income in tract). |
| Asia (Tokyo, Takamatsu, and Tokushima, Japan) - Zhe et al. (2008) | This paper, Evaluation of Shared Use of Bicycles and Pedestrians in Japan. From the perspective of **Wellbeing** | **Infrastructure** standard: As a result the necessary condition to coexistence of bicycles and pedestrians was found to be less than 0.5 pedestrians/minute per metre of sidewalk (width) and less than 3.0cyclists/minute per metre of sidewalk (width). The standard for pedestrian/bicycle share use in terms of hourly traffic volume is less than 26 pedestrians / hour and 108 cyclists / hour for 2m wide sidewalks. |

##### Across 4 dimensions

In papers that discuss and look to address multi-dimensional aspects of equity, they often refer to international guidelines, for instance

* WHO regs
* xxxxx
* xxx

In connecting the findings of the FIVE tables above (Table XX to XX). It is useful to broadly summarize how equity conceptualizations explicitly connect with standards, a few examples to begin the discussion:

* Well-being, this is related to quality of life of users within the context of transportation -> population (standard) are often used. The methods include…
* Spatial equity, this is disparity analysis -> opportunity measures (standard) are often used. The methods include…
* Rights, this is related to conceptualizing access to destination as a basic right for all -> often, infrastructure (standard) are used such as accessible bus stops, etc. ..
* Inequitable exposure, this is related to externalities associated with transportation systems -> mostly Environmental + (relative) related to air pollution XXX. Often times… a sufficient minimum can’t be created! relative equity in the externality is more fair - be it across space or population group.
* Differences between continent in the studies are very interesting….

In all these example, population standards i.e., thresholds associated with *who* is suffering an inequity, are often suggested. Population standards co-occur of.

Despite the need for and importance of setting more standards, some proposals seem arbitrary. For example, XXXX proposes 20 ferrys per day to avoid social exclusion. Justifications for this number were lacking. It is unclear if 10 or 30 ferries would make a difference in a specific quality-of-life outcome or if that number is tied to funding/resource constraints.

Even when we can identify a dimension, conceptualization, and standard for each paper, our goal is to provide a general overview and some example that may illustrate the different varieties we found in the literature. Tables XXX in the Appendix YYY provide specific examples from the literature that layout how equity standards connect to conceptualizations, unite definitions and identify potential gaps. Short-term equity goal for a city in developing countries may be different than a long-term equity goal in a developed city. Therefore, we include different contexts to highlight these differences. For each equity dimension, examples of equity conceptualizations and standards from select literature across different case study continents are summarized.

Equity dimensions: A few examples that examine multiple equity dimensions.

| Continent | Equity Dimensions | Equity conceptualizations | Standards |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Asia (Bangkok, Thailand) - | Mobility and health | From the conception of improving citizen well-being broadly, establish short-, medium-, and long-term goals for the city in collaboration with technical leaders within the municipal government. Many of the standards recommended relate directly to transportation systems. Indicators of **well-being** (urban livability) are inspired and guided by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as well other planning standards from around the world. The following are taken as measurable equity thresholds, though many indicators with no specific measurable target (i.e. some number of schools per inhabitant, people living and working in the same district, ratio of work to leisure, etc.) are suggested. | **Opportunity** **standards** are suggested: 1) Green space: % of residents living < 400 m from public open space, a large park (> 1.5ha), and/or local park, 2) Public transit access: % of residents living < 400 m of a local bus stop and <800 m of train station, 3) Facilities: % of residents living < 400 m of a community centre. The following **Infrastructure** **standard** is suggested: Canal water quality - dissolved oxygen content of equal to or less than 2.0 mL/L |
| Africa (Mekelle, Ethiopia) - | Accessibility, health | An example of a study we implicitly extracted standards from. This paper examines adaption and dissonance in Quality of Life (QoL) of residents. QoL is conceptualized along the lines of **well-being** and aspects of QoL directly tie into transport systems. They conduct a qualitative QoL survey of residents on the topic of three QoL domains: housing quality, access to important destinations, and affordability. They also measure quantitative indicators associated with these domains. We assume the equity goal for this paper is that subjective and objective QoL measures should not be mismatched: as discussed by the authors of this study, subjective QoL is higher than objective QoL the participant is experiencing adaption and in the reverse scenario the participant is experience dissonance. The reasons for adaption and dissonance are interesting, but ultimately high QoL (tied to **well-being**) is seen as the equity goal. They measure the following QoL indicators that are suggested and we interpret as standards (only those discussing transport are summarized). | **Opportunity** **standards**: 1) Access to primary education facility, percentage of households living within 1 km (walking distance) from a primary school. 2) Access to secondary education facility, percentage of households living within 2 km (walking distance) from a secondary school. 3) Access to health facility, percentage of households within 40 min walking time from a health facility. 4) Access to public transport, percentage of households within a distance of 500 m from a mini-bus stop. They also appear as **Population** **standards**: 1) Adequate family income, percentage of households earning more than the official poverty line (BOFED, 2011). 2) Subjective QoL is constructed based on the households level of satisfaction for each of the eight indicators using a six point Likert-scale (1=very satisfied to 6=very dissatisfied). |
| Europe (Castellon, Spain) - | Mobility, safety, health | Conceptualizes equity through age-friendly urban spaces that reduce (and eliminate) conditions for **transportation-related social exclusion** for older populations and prioritize those who are economically vulnerable (**vertical equity**). These guidelines are inspired by the SDGs in addition to planning guidelines used national, regional, and local guidelines used in Spain. | **Opportunity** **standards**: 1) Access to facilities needed for old age health are critical. As such, minimum distance thresholds are suggested from the geometric center of neighborhood. Neighbourhood centers should be *at least*: 1000 m from health facilities (600 m or less is preferred), elderly-specific care facilities and shops should be 600 m (300 m or less is preferred). And also **Population** **standards**: 1) Certain neighbourhoods should be prioritized above others. From this papers focus on age-friendly urban environment, they suggest that if the neighbourhood has an average old age indicator (i.e., greater than 64 years, and/or greater than 79 years, and/or aging ratio of persons aged greater than 64 relative to 15 to 64 age) should be prioritized. 2) Economic vulnerable and non-civically engaged neighbourhoods should also be prioritized. If the neighbourhood has a lower percentage of civic associations within the neighbourhood than average, and/or household income, and/or a higher than average interventions for dependency and/or social subsidies, they should be priorized. And also **Infrastructure** **standards**: 1) Green space: should be at least 10 m2 per inhabitant in the neighbourhood, greater than 15 m2 per inhab. is the goal. 2) As related to sidewalk infrastructure a*t least* 50% of all sidewalks (preferably 75% or greater) should: have a width of 1.5m or larger, ramps should have a grade of 8% or less, be well maintained (free from deficiencies), be paved for pedestrian use, and cover public transit stops. 3) Lighting is critical for traffic-safety and a sense of safety overall. As such, *at least* 50% roads should: have a min. of 35 lux (road traffic) and 20 lux (pedestrian streets), and adapted traffic lights. 4) Buildings should be age-friendly. As a proxy for the quality of residential living space quality, *at least* 50% of residential buildings in a neighbourhood should be built within the last 50 years (preferably 75% or more). In terms of physical access into the buildings, *at least* 10% should have elevators and accessible entrances (preferably 25% or more). **Environment +** standards: 1) Noise at the street level should be less than 55 dB and 45 dB (but preferably less than 50 dB and 40 dB) in the daytime and nighttime, respectively. |
| Asian (Manila, Philippine) - | Mobility, safety | The perception of pedestrians walking environments should be sufficient across 6 themes. Equity is conceptualized around **spatial equity** (equally fair walking environments for all locations) and **rights** (the right to mobility/accessibility) | Infrastructure, Opportunity, and Population standards: percieved pedestrian perception on protection, ease, equitable access, mobility, identity and enjoyment must be met. |

# Discussion and ways forward (identifying gaps and possible agenda for the future)

NOTE: This should set up a discussion on calibrating the standards to align with outcomes in addition to what we want to know more about - i.e., discuss the gaps!

## Disparity analysis and the intentional analysis of equity

The literature shows several papers doing disparity analysis without engaging with equity conceptualizations. For example, within the mobility/accessibility dimension, metrics of accessibility (usually 15 to 60 minutes) are used to show differences among areas and groups but with scarce policy and practice implications of those results. Aiming at specific goals and standards tied to conceptualizations is the ideal case. When these analysis engage with metrics that may be tied to conceptualizations (like Gini coefficient or Theil index), they usually fall short of assessing the result’s good or bad. If a Gini coefficient of 0 means that all people have the same access to public transport stops, what does it mean a 0.2, 0.3, or 0.4? Is this good or bad news for decision-makers? Are new policies needed to reduce that number to a certain threshold, orienting future interventions? These questions usually remain unanswered despite its importance.

## What’s there: and what’s missing

What *is not* in the included literature is not the focus of the review, but provides interesting avenues for future research.

1) qualitative analysis (not present) vs. what is present, quantitative and mixed-methods

2) mobilities of care destination types

## Grounded standards

Some standards seem arbitrary. Relative measures: context, temporal, and group specific. E.g. a certain group should have more access in certain situations.

Equity is not justice.

Restorative justice – e.g., repairing harm is missing from the discussion

## Conceptualizations: make it explicit and less confusing

Some conceptualizations are implicit

## Evaluate interventions and policies

There is a need to evaluate more equity interventions or policies. In our review, only 19 out of 155 studies assess specific projects with an equity lens . Examples include mode-shift from driving to active school travel (Mammen et al. (2014) ), transit fare restructures (Hickey, Lu, and Reddy (2010) ) and spatial analysis of Low Traffic Neighborhoods (Aldred et al. (2021) ). This is a key step towards transport justice; assessing the effects of policies on different dimensions and populations groups and evaluating if a specific context is moving towards equitable standards over time.

## Links between standards and outcomes

A more robust assessment of the implications of equity standards on life outcomes is still pending. Estimating the benefits of increased mobility or accessibility, or reducing affordability burdens and transport externalities needs to be associated with outcomes like life and neighborhood satisfaction, subjective well-being, mental and physical health, social capital, among others.

## Data and methods limitations

On the methodological side, more mixed methods are needed in transport equity research. Conceptualizations and standards are usually discussed from purely qualitative or quantitative approaches, a missed opportunity to combine the strengths of both approaches, whether by deep diving into some particular experiences or perceptions through qualitative methods or tailoring more meaningful quantitative analysis after qualitative explorations.

What are the sources of data and what are the motivations for some categories? POI databases typically include education, health and aggregated categories for leisure and community. Within ‘community’ are organizations, government services, visiting friends/family – very broad, grandma’s house is not there, social networks rarely incorporated. Childcare, typically daycare or facilities – domestic work, mobilities of care, mobility interdependence, not here.

Leisure destinations (e.g., green space, parks, recreation) are less studied in this context.

Some categories are missing all together – mobilities of care.

Issue of data availability

-- CONSIDER:

* We decide what is equal and not equal through planning decisions. Whether implicit or not. of course we are limited by data, but this is a call to action.

# Concluding remarks

* TBD

# Appendix

The following are additional details.

#### The search strategy:

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 7: The search query. TS = topic search (keywords, abstract, title). TASCA = subject categories. Green text area transportation system related terms, blue text are equity dimension related terms, purple text are equity/justice conceptualization related terms, and orange text are standards related terms. Hits corresponds the number of articles that the search yielded and was retained into the evidence selection process. |

Definitions of the population-concept context (PCC) used in the creation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the search strategy.

* **Population**: the focus of the included studies should be on individuals, groups, communities, or entire regional areas that are impacted by passenger transportation infrastructure and systems (i.e., all modes and flows) from the perspective of equity (i.e., fair distribution, production, and re-production of burdens and benefits). This criteria is reflected in the creation of the first set of topic search terms that relate to transportation modes (e.g., “walking” OR “cycling” OR “transit” - see green text in [Figure 7](#fig-A1) for the full list).
* **Concept**: the included studies should also include equity dimensions and conceptualizes equity as discussed in the previous section. This inclusion criteria is reflected in the second and third set of topic search terms developed in the search strategy. These terms relate to types of equity dimensions (e.g., “accessibility” OR “mobility” or “transport-related air pollution” - see blue text in the [Figure 7](#fig-A1) for the full list) and equity conceptualizations (e.g., “Justice” OR “equity” - see purple text in [Figure 7](#fig-A1) for the full list).
* **Context**: the included studies should also be limited to publications that include equity standards. Context can be more difficult to explicitly search for with key terms so synonyms for ‘standards’ were added to the query as a four set of topic search terms (e.g., threshold, indicator, criteria - see orange text in [Figure 7](#fig-A1) for full list). Additionally, journal article and conference papers, English-language literature from any country, any study design (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method studies, or conceptual frameworks), and any record published within the past 30 years are included (January 1992 to March 2022). The time period is selected as the first (to the authors knowledge) peer-reviewed article which operationalized equity standards and equity conceptualization was published in 1996 (Khisty 1996); we are broadening the search by a few years for completeness. English is selected as it is the common language spoken across the authorship team. Furthermore, records that explicitly fall within the Transportation or related topic/category is included in the query (e.g., “Transportation”, “Social Sciences”, “Geography”, “Civil Engineering”, “Philosophy” - see the [Figure 7](#fig-A1) for full query).

The **exclusion criteria** for the search are records that are not within the inclusion criteria. Specifically:

* Literature published before January 1992.
* Articles which do not include transportation equity dimensions.
* Grey as concepts contained within are frequently published in a more developed form in journals.

#### Example of the data extraction template:

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8: The data extraction template with associated defintions. |

#### Details of trends on conceptualizations and standards within equity dimensions:
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