

Transportation, Land Use, and Urban Form

When?

First Meeting: Wednesday, January 12th, 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm
Regular Days/Times: Mondays, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm (1/24, 1/31, 2/7, 2/14, 2/28, 3/6, 3/13)
Wednesdays, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm (1/26, 2/9, 3/8)
Wednesdays, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm (1/19, 2/2, 2/16, 3/1)
Field Trip: Friday, February 25th, all day
Final Exam Review: Wednesday, March 15th, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm (optional)
Final Exam: Wednesday, March 22nd, 11:30 am to 2:30 pm

Where?

Room: 2343 Public Policy Building

Who?

Instructor: Brian Taylor Office: 5383 Public Policy Building
Hours: Tuesdays and Fridays, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm
Email: btaylor@ucla.edu
Telephone: 310.825.7442

Reader: D. Gregg Doyle Office: 1355A Public Policy Building
Hours: By Appointment
Email: dgregg@ucla.edu
Telephone: 310.825.4223

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This is an introductory course in urban transportation planning that examines the evolution of urban transportation systems in the United States, with particular emphasis on the complex relationships between transportation, land use, and urban form. This is a foundation course in urban transportation planning and policy; other courses in this series examine (1) the analysis and prediction of travel behavior, (2) urban transportation system planning and analysis, (3) transportation economics, finance, and policy, and (4) transportation and the urban environment.

There are many entry-level planning positions in the transportation sector with local, county, state, and federal governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and private consulting firms. This urban transportation planning course sequence is intended to prepare you to compete successfully for many such positions. These

courses alone will not, however, prepare you to take on more technical transportation positions such as computer modeler or traffic engineer. For students interested in working in such specialized positions, additional course work outside of the Department of Urban Planning would be required.

The content of the course can be divided into three parts. The first is a historical look at the planning and development of transportation systems and urban form in the U.S. The second part looks more conceptually and theoretically at the relationships between land use and transportation. And the final part examines a number of land use and transportation policy questions facing planners today.

Part One

- The evolution of transportation systems and urban form in the U.S.
- The history and planning of public transit in U.S. metropolitan areas.
- The *conspiracy* to destroy public transit in Los Angeles.
- The evolution and planning of metropolitan street and freeway systems.
- The development of urban transportation planning policies and institutions.

Part Two

- Theories of good and bad urban form.
- Current trends in travel and urban development.
- Intra-metropolitan location theory and urban form.
- Critiques of traditional urban theories.
- The links between transportation and land use.
- The land use impacts of transportation investments.
- The transportation impacts of land use policies.

Part Three

- International comparisons of transportation and urban form.
- The metropolitan balance of jobs and housing.
- The spatial mismatch hypothesis.
- Urban design and travel behavior.
- The transportation impacts of neo-traditional and transit-oriented development.
- Cars, density, and values: Barriers to land use/transportation reform.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There are no formal prerequisites for the course, although prior course work in urban geography and/or urban economics would be helpful. There are five parts to the course: lectures and class discussion, reading assignments, written assignments, a day-long field trip, and a final examination. These parts are intended to reinforce, but not duplicate, one another.

Lectures. Most of the class time in the first two parts of the course will be devoted to lectures, though these will be punctuated with questions and short discussions. The final third of the course, which examines land use and transportation planning and policy questions, will be a mix of lectures and class discussions of the readings.

Readings. The lectures will not cover all of the material in the reading, so it is essential that you keep up with the required reading. A complete list of course topics and readings is attached. For each topic, readings are designated as required, recommended, or optional. All of the required readings have been bundled into a reader available from Course Reader Material at 1141 Westwood Boulevard in Westwood Village (310.443.3300). All of the recommended and optional readings will be available from the Graduate Reserve Room on the second floor of the University Research Library. Students are required to complete all required readings prior to the corresponding class session. For deeper coverage of each topic, you should scan the recommended readings as well. The optional readings are supplementary and are suggested if the topic is of particular interest to you. The recommended and optional readings are provided both as a resource to you and as necessary background for the preparation of your written assignments on specific topics.

Written Assignments. The written assignments for this course are attached. Three written assignments are required: an analytical memo, a field trip memo, and a critical essay. These assignments have staggered due dates timed to correspond with the subject areas covered in class. The analytical memo asks you and a partner to analyze some data pertaining to a land use/transportation issue and prepare a short (4 to 6 page) analysis in memo form. The field trip memo asks you to briefly reflect on the land use transportation relationships observed during our all-day field trip. And for the critical essay, you will do some deeper reading on one of the topics covered in the course and then write a six to twelve page critical essay on the topic.

Field Trip. Part of the course will include an all-day field trip where we will examine land use and urban development along a number of transportation corridors in the Los Angeles area. The trip will take place on Friday, February 25th. Any student unable to participate in the field trip can complete a second critical essay in lieu of the field trip. Following the field trip, you will be expected to complete a short (4 to 6 page) memo to the planning director of a local city on the feasibility of using transportation improvements to stimulate new economic development.

Examination. To give you the opportunity to synthesize the many concepts, issues, and debates covered in the course, there will be a final examination on Wednesday, March 22nd from 11:30 am to 2:30 pm. To help you prepare for the exam, there will be an optional final exam review session on Wednesday, March 15th from 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm.

Grading. Course grades will be based on the following:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| • Analytical Memo | 15 percent |
| • Field Trip Memo | 15 percent |
| • Critical Essay | 25 percent |
| • Final Examination | 35 percent |
| • Attendance/participation | <u>10 percent</u> |
| Total | 100 percent |

Please note that late papers will be accepted, but a late grade penalty of 1/3 grade will be applied to any papers turned in after the due date. The late penalty for assignments can be waived only with a written note from a medical professional.

READINGS AND LECTURE TOPICS

Part One

TOPIC 0. Overview of Course. (1/12, 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

No reading.

TOPIC 1. Issues and Concepts in Urban Transportation Planning. (1/19, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

Required

Wachs, Martin (1993). "Learning from Los Angeles: Transport, Urban Form, and Air Quality," *Transportation*, 20: pages 329-354.

Lynch, Kevin (1981). "Access," *A Theory of Good City Form*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. Pages 187-204.

Recommended

Hanson, Susan (1995). "Getting There: Urban Transportation in Context," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 3-25.

Optional

Heilbrun, James and Patrick A. McGuire (1987). "The Economics of Urban Transportation," in *Urban Economics and Public Policy*, Third Edition. New York: Saint Martin's Press. Pages 173-206.

Heilbrun, James and Patrick A. McGuire (1987). "Urban Transportation Policy," in *Urban Economics and Public Policy*, Third Edition. New York: Saint Martin's Press. Pages 207-237.

TOPIC 2. The Tandem Evolution of Transportation Systems and Urban Form. (1/24 and 1/26, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Lynch, Kevin (1981). "What is the Form of a City, and How is it Made?" in *A Theory of Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Pages 37-50.

Jackson, Kenneth T. "The Transportation Revolution and the Erosion of the Walking City," in *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pages 20-44.

Recommended

Muller, Peter (1995). "Transportation and Urban Form: Stages in the Spatial Evolution of the American Metropolis," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 26-52.

Schaeffer, K. H. and Elliott Sclar (1980). "The Walking City, the Tracked City, and the Rubber City," *Access for All: Transportation and Urban Growth*. New York: Columbia University Press. Pages 8-60.

Optional

Hall, Peter (1988). "The Mass Transit Suburb: London, Paris, Berlin, New York, 1900-1940," in *Cities of Tomorrow*. New York: Basil Blackwell. Pages 47-85.

Hall, Peter (1988). "The Automobile Suburb: Long Island, Wisconsin, Los Angeles, Paris, 1920-1987," in *Cities of Tomorrow*. New York: Basil Blackwell. Pages 273-318.

TOPIC 3. The Evolution and Planning of Public Transportation in U.S. Cities. (1/26 and 1/31, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Jones, David (1985). "Transit's Growth and Decline: A Play in Eight Acts," *Urban Transit Policy: An Economic and Political History*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Pages 28-95.

Adler, Sy (1987). "Why BART but no LART? The Political Economy of Rail Rapid Transit Planning in the Los Angeles and San Francisco Metropolitan Areas, 1945-1957," *Planning Perspectives*, 2, pages 149-174.

Recommended

Smerk, George M. (1992). "Public Transportation and the City," in *Public Transportation*, Second Edition, George E. Gray and Lester A. Hoel, Editors. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Pages 3-23.

Hilton, George W. (1985). "The Rise and Fall of Monopolized Transit," in *Urban Transit: The Private Challenge to Public Transportation*, Charles A. Lave, Editor. Cambridge: Ballinger. Pages 31-48.

Optional

Black, Alan (1995). "The History of Urban Transit," *Urban Mass Transportation Planning*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. Pages 13-40.

TOPIC 4. Was There a Conspiracy to Destroy Public Transit in Los Angeles? (1/31, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Plane, David A. (1995). "The Great Transportation Conspiracy," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages

445-447.

Kwitny, Jonathan (1981). "The Great Transportation Conspiracy: How GM and its Allies Dismantled America's Mass Transit," *Harper's*, 262:1569, February, pages 14-15, 18, 20-21.

Jones, David (1985). "The National City Lines Controversy," *Urban Transit Policy: An Economic and Political History*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Pages 63-64.

Adler, Sy (1991). "The Transformation of the Pacific Electric Railway: Bradford Snell, Roger Rabbit, and the Politics of Transportation in Los Angeles," *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 27:1, September, pages 51-86.

Recommended

Snell, Bradford C. (1974). "American Ground Transport: A Proposal for Restructuring the Automobile, Truck, Bus, and Rail Industries," *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary*, Appendix to Part A. Washington, DC: United States Senate. Pages A1-A103.

General Motors Corporation (1974). "The Truth About *American Ground Transport*: A Reply by General Motors," *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary*, Appendix to Part A. Washington, DC: United States Senate. Pages A107-A127.

Optional

Yago, Glenn (1984). "The Coming Crisis of US Transportation," *Urban Praxis*. Pages 583-585.

Richmond, Jonathan E. D. (1991). "The Rise and Fall of the Pacific Electric: A Case-Study in Technological Evolution and Displacement," in *Transport of Delight: The Mythical Conception of Rail Transit in Los Angeles*. Cambridge, MA: MIT PhD Dissertation. Pages 23-40.

TOPIC 5. The Evolution and Planning Streets and Highways in U.S. Cities. (2/2, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm and 2/7, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Wachs, Martin (1984). "Autos, Transit, and the Sprawl of Los Angeles: The 1920s," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 50:3, Summer, pages 297-310.

Foster, Mark (1981). "Transit Planning versus Automobile Planning," *From Streetcar to Superhighway: American City Planners and Urban Transportation, 1900-1940*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Pages 151-176.

Jones, David (1989). "The California Innovation," *California's Freeway Era in Historical Perspective*. Berkeley: Institute of Transportation Studies. Pages 1-36.

Recommended

Foster, Mark (1981). "The Planners and the Automobile," *From Streetcar to Superhighway: American City Planners and Urban Transportation, 1900-1940*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Pages 91-115.

Optional

Taylor, Brian D. (1995). "Public Perceptions, Fiscal Realities, and Freeway Planning: The

California Case," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61:1, pages 43-56.

Gifford, Jonathan (1984). "The Innovation of the Interstate Highway System," *Transportation Research A*, 18A:4, pages 319-332.

TOPIC 6. Evolution of Transportation Planning Policies and Institutions. (2/7, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Wachs, Martin (1995). "The Political Context of Transportation Policy," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 269-286.

Weiner, Edward (1992). "History of Urban Transportation Planning," in *Public Transportation*, Second Edition, George E. Gray and Lester A. Hoel, Editors. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Pages 46-76.

Recommended

Altshuler, Alan (1979). "Recent System and Policy Evolution," in *The Urban Transportation System: Politics and Policy Innovation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. Pages 19-84.

Meyer, Michael and Eric Miller (1984). "Urban Transportation Planning: Context and Definition," *Urban Transportation Planning: A Decision-Oriented Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pages 1-19.

Optional

Reed, George L. (1992). "Regulatory and Legal Considerations," in *Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation Planning Handbook*, John D. Edwards, Jr., Editor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Pages 501-514.

Reed, Harry A. (1992). "Statewide and Regional Transportation Planning," in *Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation Planning Handbook*, John D. Edwards, Jr., Editor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Pages 353-386.

Part Two

TOPIC 7. Normative Theory: Are There "Good" and "Bad" Urban Forms? (2/9, 2:00 pm 3:30 pm)

Required

Queenan, Joe (1998). "Bright Lights, Big City," *San Francisco Examiner Magazine*, 6 December, pages 38-39.

Johnson, Gary T. and Christopher Silver (1997). "Alternative Views of Sprawl," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:1, page 94.

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson (1997). "Are Compact Cities a Desirable Goal?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:1, pages 95-106.

Ewing, Reid (1997). "Is Los Angeles-Style Sprawl Desirable?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:1, pages 107-126.

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson (1997). "Where's the Sprawl?" *Journal of the American*

Planning Association, 63:2, pages 275-278.

Crane, Randall (1997). "Sprawl, I Hardly Know Ye," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:1, pages 278-279.

Recommended

Burchell, Robert W., et al. 1998. *Costs of sprawl revisited: the evidence of sprawl's negative and positive effects*. Washington, DC: Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board.

Barnett, J. (1989). "Redesigning the Metropolis: The Case for a New Approach," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 55:2, pages 131-135.

Audirac, Ivonne, Anne H. Shermeyen, and Marc T. Smith (1990). "Ideal Urban Form and Visions of the Good Life: Florida's Growth Management Dilemma," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 56:4, pages 470-482.

Neuman, Michael (1991). "Utopia, Dystopia, Diaspora," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 57:3, September, pages 344-347.

Audirac, Ivonne, Anne H. Shermeyen, and Marc T. Smith (1992). "Is the Development Debate of the 1990s to Resonate as a Fanfare for Community?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58:4, Autumn, pages 514-516.

Optional

Lynch, Kevin (1981). "Between Heaven and Hell," in *A Theory of Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Pages 51-72.

Lynch, Kevin (1981). "Three Normative Theories," in *A Theory of Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Pages 73-98.

Lynch, Kevin (1981). "But is a General Normative Theory Possible?," in *A Theory of Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Pages 99-109.

TOPIC 8. Current Trends in Travel, Urban Development, and Planning. (2/9 and 2/14, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Nelson, Arthur C. and Kenneth J. Dueker (1990). "The Exurbanization of American and its Planning Policy Implications," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 9:2, pages 91-100.

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson (1996). "Beyond Polycentricity: The Dispersed Metropolis, Los Angeles, 1970-1990," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62:3, pages 289-295.

Bourne, Larry S. (1992). "Self-Fulfilling Prophecies? Decentralization, Inner City Decline, and the Quality of Urban Life," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58:4, pages 509-513.

Recommended

Gordon, Peter, Harry W. Richardson, and Myung-Jin Jun (1992). "The Commuting Paradox: Evidence from the Top Twenty," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 57:4, Fall, pages 416-420.

Frey, William H. (1993). "The New Urban Revival in the United States," *Urban Studies*, 30:4/5, pages 741-774.

Gordon, Peter, Ajay Kumar, and Harry Richardson (1989). "Congestion, Changing Metropolitan Structure, and City Size in the United States," *International Regional Science Review*, 12:1, pages 45-56.

Optional

Bourne, Larry S. (1989). "Are New Urban Forms Emerging? Empirical Tests for Canadian Urban Areas" *The Canadian Geographer*, 33:4, pages 312-328.

Clark, William A. V. and Marianne Kuijpers-Linde (1994). "Commuting in Restructuring Regions," *Urban Studies*, 31:3, pages 465-483.

Hart, Tom (1992). "Transport, the Urban Pattern, and Regional Change, 1960-2010," *Urban Studies*, 29:3/4, pages 483-503.

TOPIC 9. Transportation, Intra-Metropolitan Location Theory, and Urban Form. (2/14, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Pickrell, Don (1999). "Transportation and Land Use," *Essays in Transportation Economics and Policy: A Handbook in Honor of John R. Meyer*, Gomez-Ibanez, Tye, and Winston, Editors. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. Pages 403-435.

Skinner, Robert E., Jr. (1996). "Point of View: The Transportation-Land Use Interaction -- Introduction," *TR News*, 187, page 6.

Moore, Terry (1996). "Premises and Promises: Putting the Transportation-Land Use Relationship in Context," *TR News*, 187, pages 7-8.

Cervero, Robert and John Landis (1996). "Why the Transportation-Land Use Connection is Still Important," *TR News*, 187, pages 9-11.

Giuliano, Genevieve (1996). "Transportation, Land Use, and Public Policy," *TR News*, 187, pages 12-13.

Leinberger, Christopher B. (1996). "Standardizing the American Dream," *TR News*, 187, pages 14-15.

Epstein, Lee R. (1996). "Integrating the Environment and Land Use into Transportation Decisionmaking," *TR News*, 187, pages 16-17.

Recommended

Heilbrun, James and Patrick A. McGuire (1987). "Site Rent, Land-Use Patterns, and the Form of the City," in *Urban Economics and Public Policy*, Third Edition. New York: Saint Martin's Press. Pages 107-138.

Garrison, William L. and Elizabeth Deakin (1992). "Land Use," in Gray and Hoel, Editors, *Public Transportation: Planning, Operations, and Management*, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Pages 527-550.

Giuliano, Genevieve (1989). "New Directions for Understanding Transportation and Land Use," *Environment and Planning A*, 21, pages 145-159.

Optional

Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch (1987). "Places as Commodities," in *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pages 17-49.

Levinson, David M. and Ajay Kumar (1994). "The Rational Locator: Why Travel Times Have Remained Stable," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 60:3, Summer, pages 319-332.

TOPIC 10. The Land Use Effects of Transportation Policies. (2/16, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

Required

Giuliano, Genevieve (1995). "Land Use Impacts of Transportation Investments: Highways and Transit," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: Guilford Press. Pages 305-341.

Loukaitou-Sideris (1996). "There's No There There: Or Why Neighborhoods Don't Readily Develop Near Light-Rail Transit Stations," *Access*, 9, pages 2-6.

Recommended

Huang, Herman (1996). "The Land Use Impacts of Urban Rail Transit Systems," *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(1): 17-30.

Cervero, Robert and Samuel Seskin (1995). "An Evaluation of the Relationships Between Transit and Urban Form," *Research Results Digest*, Transit Cooperative Research Program, Federal Transit Administration, 7, June, pages 1-55.

Kelly, Eric Damian (1994). "The Transportation-Land Use Link," *Journal of Planning Literature*, 9:2, November, pages 128-145.

Optional

Cervero, Robert and John Landis (1997). "Twenty Years of the Bay Area Rapid Transit System: Land Use and Development Impacts," *Transportation Research A*, 31(4): 309-333.

Boarnet, Marlon and Randall Crane (1997). "L.A. Story: A Reality Check for Transit-Based Housing," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:2, pages 189-204.

TOPIC 11. The Transportation Effects of Land Use Policies. (2/16, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

Required

Boarnet, Marlon, and Sharon Sarmiento. 1998. Can land use policy really affect travel behavior? *Urban Studies* 35, no. 7: 1155-69.

Willson, Richard W. (1995). "Suburban Parking Requirements: A Tacit Policy for Automobile Use and Sprawl," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61:1, pages 29-42.

Recommended

Kockelman, Kara. 1997. Travel behavior as a function of accessibility, land use mixing, and land use balance: evidence from the San Francisco Bay area. *Transportation Research Record* 1607: 116-25.

McNally, Michael G., and Anup Kulkarni. 1997. Assessment of influence of land use-transportation system on travel behavior. *Transportation Research Record* 1607: 105-15.

Cervero, Robert and Roger Gorham (1995). "Commuting in Transit versus Automobile Neighborhoods," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61:2, pages 210-225.

Lawrence D. Frank and Gary Pivo (1994). "Impacts of Mixed Use and Density on Utilization of Three Modes of Travel: Single-Occupant Vehicle, Transit, and Walking," *Transportation Research Record*, 1466:, pages 44-52.

Optional

Knight, Robert L. and Lisa Trygg (1977). "Evidence of Land Use Impacts of Rapid Transit Systems," *Transportation*, 6:3, September, pages 231-247.

Cervero, Robert (1994). "Rail-Oriented Development in California: How Successful?" *Transportation Quarterly*, 48:1, Winter, pages 22-44.

Part Three

TOPIC 12: Transportation and Urban Form: International Comparisons. (2/28, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Newman, Peter W. G. and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy (1989). "Gasoline Consumption and Cities: A Comparison of U.S. Cities with a Global Survey," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 55:1, Winter, pages 24-37.

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson (1989). "Gasoline Consumption and Cities: A Reply," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 55:3, Summer, pages 342-346.

Black, Alan, John Pucher, Jeffrey M. Zupan, Peter W. G. Newman, and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy (1990). "A Round Robin on Urban Transportation and Choice," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 56:1, Winter, pages 88-93.

Gómez-Ibáñez, José (1991). "A Global View of Automobile Dependence," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 57:3, Summer, pages 376-379.

Newman, Peter W. G. and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy (1992). "Is There a Role for Physical Planners?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58:3, Summer, pages 353-362.

Recommended

Anderson, William P., Pavlos S. Kanaroglou, and Eric J. Miller (1996). "Urban form, energy, and the environment: a review of issues, evidence, and policy," *Urban Studies*, 33(1): 7-35.

Gordon, Peter, Ajay Kumar, and Harry W. Richardson (1989). "The Influence of Metropolitan Spatial Structure on Commuting Times," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 26, pages 138-149.

Optional

Newman, Peter W. G. and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy (1989). *Cities and Automobile Dependence: An International Sourcebook*. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing.

TOPIC 13: Transportation, Urban Form, and Public Policy: International Comparisons. (2/28, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Pucher, John (1995). "Urban Passenger Transport in the United States and Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Public Policies -- Part 1: Travel Behaviour, Urban Development, and Automobile Use," *Transport Reviews*, 15:2, pages 99-117.

Pucher, John (1995). "Urban Passenger Transport in the United States and Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Public Policies -- Part 2: Public Transit, Overall Comparisons, and Recommendations" *Transport Reviews*, 15:3, pages 211-227.

Rabinovitch, Jonas and Josef Leitman (1996). "Urban Planning in Curitiba," *Scientific American*, March, 46-53.

Recommended

Gakenheimer, Ralph (1993). "Land Use/Transportation Planning: New Possibilities for Developing and Developed Countries," *Transportation Quarterly*, 47:2, April, pages 311-322.

Khisty, C. Jotin (1994). "Transportation in Developing Countries: Obvious Problems, Possible Solutions," *Transportation Research Record*, 1396:, pages 44-49.

Dimitriou, Harry T. (1994). "Policy Making and Planning for Nonmotorized Transportation Systems in Third World Cities: A Developmental Approach," *Transportation Research Record*, 1396:, pages 50-56.

Optional

Pucher, John and Stefan Kurth (1995). "Making Transit Irresistible: Lessons from Europe," *Transportation Quarterly*, 49(1): 117-128.

Adler, Sy (1988). "A Comparative Analysis of Rail Transit Politics, Policy, and Planning in Canada and the United States," *Logistics and Transportation Review*, 24:3, pages 265-279.

Cervero, Robert (1986). "Urban Transit in Canada: Integration and Innovation at its Best," *Transportation Quarterly*, 40:3, July, pages 293-316.

TOPIC 14: Is the Metropolitan Balance of Jobs and Housing a Transportation Issue? (3/1, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

Required

Giuliano, Genevieve (1992). "Is Jobs-Housing Balance a Transportation Issue?" *Transportation Research Record*, 1305, pages 305-312.

Levine, Jonathan (1998). "Rethinking Accessibility and Jobs-Housing Balance," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64(2): 133-149.

Recommended

Cervero, Robert (1989). "Jobs-Housing Balancing and Regional Mobility," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 55:2, pages 136-150.

Wachs, Martin, Brian Taylor, Ned Levine, and Paul Ong (1993). "The Changing Commute: A Case-Study of the Jobs-Housing Relationship over Time," *Urban Studies*, 30:10, pages 1713-1731.

Cervero, Robert (1996). "Jobs-Housing Balancing Revisited: Trends and Impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62:4, pages 492-511.

Peng, Zhong-Ren (1997). "The Jobs-Housing Balance and Urban Commuting," *Urban Studies*, 34:8, pages 1215-1235.

Optional

Richardson, Harry and Peter Gordon (1989). "Counting Nonwork Trips: The Missing Link in Transportation, Land Use, and Urban Policy," *Urban Land*, September, pages 6-18.

Levine, Jonathan C. (1992). "Decentralization of Jobs and the Emerging Suburban Commute," *Transportation Research Record*, 1364, pages 71-80.

Giuliano, Genevieve and Kenneth A. Small (1993). "Is the Journey to Work Explained by Urban Structure?" *Urban Studies*, 30:9, pages 1485-1500.

Handy, Susan (1993). "Regional versus Local Accessibility: Implications for Nonwork Travel," *Transportation Research Record*, 1400, pages 58-66.

TOPIC 15. The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis. (3/1, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm)

Required

Cervero, Robert (1997). "Tracking Accessibility," *Access*, 11, Fall, pages 27-31.

Blumenberg, Evelyn and Paul Ong (1997). "Can Welfare Recipients Afford to Work Far From Home?" *Access*, 10, Spring, pages 15-19.

Hughes, Mark A. (1991). "Employment Decentralization and Accessibility: A Strategy for Stimulating Regional Mobility," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 57:3, pages 288-298.

Recommended

Holzer, Harry J. (1991) "The Spatial Mismatch: What Has the Evidence Shown?" *Urban Studies*, 28(1): 105-122.

Kain, John (1992). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Three Decades Later," *Housing Policy Debate*, 3(2): 371-460.

Ihlanfeldt, Keith and David L. Sjoquist (1998). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: A Review of Recent Studies and Their Implications for Welfare Reform," *Housing Policy Debate*, 9(4): 849-892.

Optional

Taylor, Brian D. and Paul M. Ong (1995). "Spatial Mismatch or Automobile Mismatch? An Examination of Race, Residence, and Commuting in U.S. Metropolitan Areas," forthcoming in *Urban Studies*, 32:9, November, pages 1537-1557.

Ellwood, David T. (1986). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Are There Jobs Missing in the Ghetto?," in Freeman, Editor, *The Black Youth Employment Crisis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pages 147-190.

Gordon, Peter, Ajay Kumar, and Harry W. Richardson (1989). "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Some New Evidence," *Urban Studies*, 26, pages 315-326.

TOPIC 16: Urban Design and Travel Behavior. (3/6 and 3/8, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Steiner, Ruth L. (1994). "Residential Density and Travel Patterns: Review of the Literature," *Transportation Research Record*, 1466:, pages 37-43.

Ewing, Reid, Padma Haliyur, and G. William Page (1994). "Getting Around a Traditional City, a Suburban Planned Unit Development, and Everything in Between," *Transportation Research Record*, 1466:, pages 53-62.

Recommended

Cervero, Robert (1996). "Traditional Neighborhoods and Commuting in the San Francisco Bay Area," *Transportation*, 23: 373-394.

Cervero, Robert (1991). "Congestion Relief: The Land Use Alternative," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 10:2, Winter, pages 119-129.

Optional

Shaw, John (1993). "Transit-Based Housing and Residential Satisfaction: Review of the Literature and Methodological Approach," *Transportation Research Record*, 1400, pages 82-89.

Atash, Farhad (1993). "Mitigating Traffic Congestion in Suburbs: An Evaluation of Land-Use Strategies," *Transportation Quarterly*, 47:4, October, pages 507-524.

TOPIC 17: New Urbanism and Transportation. (3/6 and 3/8, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Cervero, Robert (1995). "Why Go Anywhere?" *Scientific American*, September, pages 92-93.

Crane, Randall (1998). "Travel by Design?" *Access*, 12, 2-7.

Levine, Jonathan (1999). "Access to Choice," *Access*, 14, 16-19.

Audirac, Ivonne and Anne H. Shermeyen (1994). "An Evaluation of Neotraditional Design's Social Prescription: Postmodern Placebo or Remedy for Suburban Malaise?" *Journal of Planning Research and Education*, 13:3, pages 161-173.

Recommended

Ryan, Sherry, and Michael G. McNally. 1995. Accessibility of neotraditional neighborhoods: a review of design concepts, policies, and recent literature. *Transportation Research A* 29: 87-105.

Crane, Randall (1996). "Cars and Drivers in the New Suburbs: Linking Access to Travel in Neotraditional Planning," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62:1, pages 51-65.

Messenger, Todd, and Reid Ewing. 1996. Transit-oriented development in the Sunbelt. *Transportation Research Record* 1552:

Southworth, Michael (1997). "Walkable Suburbs? An Evaluation of Neotraditional Communities at the Urban Edge," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63:1, pages 28-44.

Boarnet, Marlon G. and Nicholas S. Compin (1999). "Transit-Oriented Development in San Diego County: The Incremental Implementation of a Planning Idea," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(1): 80-95.

Optional

Cervero, Robert (1994). "Transit Villages: From Idea to Implementation," *Access*, 5, pages 8-13.

Bernick, Michael (1996). "Transit Villages: Tools for Revitalizing the Inner City," *Access*, 9, pages 13-17.

Calthorpe, Peter (1986). "The Urban Context," in *Sustainable Communities: A New Design Synthesis for Cities, Suburbs, and Towns*, Sim Van der Ryn and Peter Calthorpe, Editors. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books. Pages 1-4.

Calthorpe and Associates (1992). *Transit-Oriented Development Impacts on Travel Behavior*. Marin County: Calthorpe and Associates. Pages 1-15.

Calthorpe, Peter (1989). "Pedestrian Pockets: New Strategies for Suburban Growth," in *The Pedestrian Pocket Book*, Doug Kelbaugh, Editor. New York: Princeton Architectural Press. Pages 7-20.

TOPIC 18: Cars, Density, and Values. (3/13, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm)

Required

Holtz Kay, Jane (1994). "Hell on Wheels," *Planning*, January, pages 7-10.

Wilson, James Q. (1997). "Cars and Their Enemies," *Commentary*, 104(1): 17-23.

Ehrenhalt, Alan (1997). "The Asphalt Rebellion," *Governing*, October, pages 20-24, 26.

Jones, David W. (1998). "Voting with Our Wheels," paper presented at *Financing the Future: The UCLA Symposium on the Transportation-Land Use-Air Quality Connection*, Lake Arrowhead, CA, December.

Recommended

Deakin, Elizabeth (1989). "Land Use and Transportation Planning in Response to Congestion Problems: A Review and Critique," *Transportation Research Record*, 1237, pages 77-86.

Plane, David A. (1995). "Urban Transportation: Policy Alternatives," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Second Edition, Susan Hanson, Editor. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 445-447.

Optional

Altshuler, Alan (1979). "Politics and Innovation," in *The Urban Transportation System: Politics and Policy Innovation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. Pages 85-99.

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

All of the written assignments for this course are detailed below. You are required to complete (1) any one of the eight critical essay assignments, (2) any one (in groups of two) of the analysis memos, and (3) one field trip report. As you can see, you have plenty of choices in the paper and memo topics. Each assignment has a specific due date, so plan your time carefully. Please note that late papers will be accepted, but a late grade penalty of 1/3 grade per week will be applied to any papers turned in after the due dates listed above. All written assignments (hardcopy only) should be turned into D. Gregg Doyle's mailbox on the third floor of the Public Policy Building by the due date and time.

ANALYTICAL MEMO

Select any one assignment from the following four. The memo should run four to eight pages of double-spaced text plus tables, charts, maps and/or illustrations. Work in groups of two: memos will not be accepted from individuals.

MEMO 1: How is the Internet developing as a research tool for planners interested in land use/transportation topics?

The Internet provides planners with very specialized interests an opportunity to communicate and share information in ways that were not previously available. Yet the quality of the information on the Internet is uneven (even in government agency home pages) and searches are sometimes frustrating. Conduct an Internet research project on station area development around the stations of new light rail transit (LRT) systems in cities. Report on the ten best web sites, list serves, news groups, or other forums that you find, providing an address and a brief review of the content. Select two sites for a more detailed review. Provide a critical review of these sites, addressing questions such as: Does the site provide the type of information that a planner would need? Are data sets available for downloading? Is the information properly documented? Is it possible for the user to judge the validity of the information? Is the site *too* technical? Your memo should list the ten sites, provide brief descriptions, and provide two detailed reviews. (Note: this assignment, like the others, should be submitted via hardcopy).

Due: Tuesday, January 31st, Noon.

MEMO 2: Location theory in practice

The readings for Heilbrun and McGuire reading for Topic 9 provides model for understanding the location patterns of households and businesses. The core of bid rent theory suggests that transportation access plays a pivotal role in location decisions, and the appraiser's maxim of "location, location, location" reinforces this view. Yet, as the Giuliano reading suggests, transportation accessibility is more ubiquitous than ever before and telecommunication development may further loosen traditional transportation-based locational determinants. This assignment asks you to interview those who are making or influencing

actual development or location decisions to determine how non-theorists view transportation as a locational determinant.

Choose either residential or business uses for your assignment. In either sector, narrow your topic to a particular type of residential or business use. Then, find someone working in the private sector whose core activity involves location decisions of businesses or households and interview them about the role of transportation in determining location and land value. For residential uses, your informant could be a real estate agent, a construction lender, or a relocation consultant. For business uses, your informant could be a developer, a business owner, a lease agent, a lender, or a location consultant. Develop a set of questions before your schedule your interview (please include them at the end of your memo). After you have conducted the interview, summarize the results and compare the views you heard with the literature. Are they consistent? If not, what is different?

Due: Tuesday, February 29th, Noon.

MEMO 3: Can the gravity model help us assess jobs housing balance policies?

The gravity model is a simple formulation used in many planning activities. As discussed in the Hanson reading for Topic 1, it can predict the number of trips between zones, the relative attractiveness of land use districts and even migration patterns. In regional transportation models, the gravity model is used to predict the distribution of trips between zones. The model comes from an analogy to the gravitational interaction of physical bodies distributed over space. Two relationships are key: attraction between two areas is positively related to their size (a measure of attractiveness) and negatively related to the distance between them. The distance decay coefficient represents the degree to which travelers seek to avoid longer travel distances, and therefore is the key to predicting responses to jobs housing balance proposals.

The assignment is to create a very simple hypothetical city using data and a gravity model formula that will be provided in a separate handout. You will build your hypothetical model on a spreadsheet and then test a jobs housing balance scenarios. Your memo should examine:

1. The number of work trips between trip origin zones and trip destination zones. Create summary measures of your results, including a graphic representation of your results.
2. The impact on predicted trip distribution with a higher distance decay coefficient.
3. The impact on predicted trip distribution if a jobs/housing balance policy were implemented. You will develop a scenario of how the distribution of origins and destinations might change between zones and determine the predicted change in vehicle miles of travel (VMT).

Your memo should conclude with comments on the usefulness of the gravity model for assessing jobs/housing balance proposals and with suggestions for analytic approaches and variables that would be useful.

Due: Tuesday, March 14th, Noon.

MEMO 4: How does urban form influence travel behavior?

This assignment asks you to explore the relationship between urban form and transportation. The data in the 1989 Newman and Kenworthy article for Topic 12 provide various measures of urban form and transportation in ten large U.S. cities. Your job is to explore the relationships between the urban form and transportation variables and to develop some hypotheses that could be verified by subsequent in-depth study. The hypotheses should express a relationship between one land use and one transportation variable (be sure to note the direction(s) of causality).

Use quantitative techniques to explore three or four relationships. These can include descriptive statistics, graphs and plots of relationships between variables, and calculating correlation coefficients. Think of this work as your preliminary exploration of the data before defining a major research project. Because so much data are provided, you must decide which variables are of the greatest interest, and focus your investigations on them.

For each relationship you examine, write a clear statement of the hypothesis, report on your visual analysis of the data, including comments on outliers, report on the calculated correlation coefficients, and provide a written commentary on whether the analysis supported or did not support your initial hypothesis. In concluding your memo comment on the degree to which your exploration shows that urban form indicators are related to travel behavior, and if they are, whether the relationships are consistent with the literature.

Due: Tuesday, March 21st, Noon.

FIELD TRIP

Part of the course will include a field trip where we will visit a number of transportation corridors in the Los Angeles area. We will see older corridors of urban streets and boulevards, dense population, and frequent local bus service; freeways with express bus operations on exclusive busways; a light rail line in the median strip of a freeway; light rail running at the surface along conventional boulevards; and a partially completed underground heavy rail line. We will also see a wide variety of urban development adjacent to stations and along these rights-of-way.

Following this field trip, you are to write a four to six page double-spaced memorandum to your boss (the Planning Director of Los Angeles) on the potential of using new public transportation investments to attract new development to economically depressed parts of Los Angeles. In this memo you should reflect on class lectures, discussions, and readings to interpret the relationships between land uses and transportation services observed on the field trip. Did the availability of one mode of travel versus another seem to strongly influence the nature and density of development along the transportation rights-of-way? Did the age of a community, its stock of existing land use, its racial and ethnic composition, and its condition and cleanliness tend to determine or limit the opportunity to couple land use changes with new transit investments? Based upon what you have seen in Los Angeles, what do you conclude are the critical factors planners must consider in developing transportation services which logically relate to and reinforce land use patterns? Your memo should conclude with specific conclusions and recommendations on the potential of using public transportation investments as a tool community economic development.

Due date: Tuesday, March 7th, Noon.

CRITICAL ESSAY

This assignment gives you an opportunity to reflect in depth on one of the many topics covered in this course. For any one of the eight assignments listed below, you should carefully review all of the related class reading and write a six to twelve page (not counting the bibliography) typed, double spaced critical review of the issue. Your assignment is is not to summarize the content of the reading and lectures, but rather to critically evaluate the principal issues and/or arguments raised in the reading in light of both your own experiences and the related material covered in class lectures and discussion.

You may summarize the principal findings and conclusions of the various readings, but keep the amount of your review devoted to a summary to a minimum. Feel free to develop your own ideas on the subject matter, provided your ideas are supported by argument and related to the issue in a systematic way. You are not expected to do any outside research or reading for your essay; you should, however, cite your sources and include a bibliography.

ESSAY 1: Was there a conspiracy to destroy public transit in Los Angeles?

In 1974, Bradford Snell argued before the U.S. Senate that a secret coalition of auto, oil, and tire companies conspired to destroy public transit systems in Los Angeles and around the U.S. Snell maintained that these "rubber interests" purchased thriving rail transit systems and converted them from rail lines to buses in an effort to degrade the quality of transit service and push people into private automobiles. Snell concluded that, without the monopolistic actions of these "rubber interests," transit systems would have a much larger role in U.S. metropolitan areas.

Your assignment is carefully review all of the readings for Topic 4 and, in light of these readings, class discussion, and your own views, assess the arguments for and against Snell's conspiracy theory. What are the principal issues to be considered? What evidence is available to support or refute Snell's claims? And, after weighing the issues and evidence, what position do you take?

Due: Thursday, February 10th at Noon.

ESSAY 2: Book review.

Listed below is a list of books dealing with one or more aspects of transportation history and policy. The books vary quite significantly, ranging from even-handed to polemical, and from anti-automobile to anti-transit.

You should evaluate the main argument or arguments in the book in light of your own experiences and the related materials covered in class readings and lectures. Remember, your assignment is is not to summarize the book's contents. You may summarize the principal findings and conclusions of the author, but keep the amount of your review devoted to a summary to a minimum.

You should be able to find most, if not all, of the books listed below in the UCLA Libraries, but don't wait until the last minute to find that none of your top choices are available. If a book you are interested in is not available in the libraries, come see me. Finally, if none of the books listed below interests you, we can discuss alternatives.

Due: Thursday, February 17th at Noon.

- Baumbach Jr., Richard O. and William E. Borah (1981). *The Second Battle of New Orleans: A History of the Vieux Carre Riverfront Expressway Controversy*. Birmingham: University of Alabama Press.
- Barrett, Paul (1983). *The Automobile and Urban Transit: The Formation of Public Policy in Chicago, 1900-1930*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Berger, Michael L. (1979). *The Devil Wagon in God's Country: The Automobile and Social Change in Rural America, 1893-1929*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books.
- Bottles, Scott L. (1987). *Los Angeles and the Automobile: The Making of a Modern City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brilliant, Ashleigh (1989). *The Great Car Craze: How Southern California Collided with the Automobile in the 1920s*. Santa Barbara: Woodbridge Press.
- Brodsky, David (1981). *L.A. Freeway: An Appreciative Essay*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- Cudahy, Brian J. (1990). *Cash, Tokens, and Transfers: A History of Urban Mass Transit in North America*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Downs, Anthony (1992). *Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Fischler, Stanley I. (1979). *Moving Millions: An Inside Look at Mass Transit*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Flink, James J. (1970). *America Adopts the Automobile: 1895-1910*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Flink, James J. (1975). *The Car Culture*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Flink, James J. (1988). *The Automobile Age*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Foster, Mark S. (1981). *From Streetcar to Superhighway: American City Planners and Urban Transportation, 1900-1940*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gakenheimer, Ralph (1976). *Transportation Planning as Response to Controversy: The Boston Case*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Gilbert, Gorman and Robert Samuels (1982). *The Taxicab: An Urban Transportation Survivor*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hamer, Andrew N. (1976). *The Selling of Rail Rapid Transit*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Jones, David W., Jr. (1985). *Urban Transit Policy: An Economic and Political History*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, David W., Jr. (1989). *California's Freeway Era in Historical Perspective*. Berkeley: Institute of Transportation Studies.
- Lupo, Alan, Frank Colcord, and Edmund P. Fowler (1971). *Rites of Way: The Politics of Transportation in Boston and the U.S. City*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Mogridge, Martin J. H. (1990). *Travel in Towns: Jam Yesterday, Jam Today, and Jam Tomorrow?*. London and Basingstoke: McMillan Reference Books.
- Newman, Peter W.G. and Jeffrey R. Kenworthy (1989). *Cities and Automobile Dependence: A Sourcebook*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Oppel, Frank (1989). *Motoring in America: The Early Years*. Secaucus, NJ: Castle Books.

- Post, Robert C. (1989). *Street Railways and the Growth of Los Angeles: Horse, Cable, Electric Lines*. San Marino: Golden West Books.
- Preston, Howard L. (1979). *Automobile Age in Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Richmond, Jonathan (1991). *Transport of Delight: The Mythical Conception of Rail Transit in Los Angeles*. Cambridge: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.
- Rimmer, Peter (1986). *Riksha to Rapid Transit: Urban Public Transport Systems and Public Policy in Southeast Asia*. Sydney: Pergamon Press.
- Rose, Mark H. (1979). *Interstate Express Highway Politics: 1941-1956*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- Schaeffer, K.H. and Elliott Sclar (1980). *Access for All: Transportation and Urban Growth*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Seely, Bruce E. (1987). *Building the American Highway System: Engineers as Policy makers*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Taebel, Delbert A. and James V. Cornehls (1977). *The Political Economy of Urban Transportation*. Port Washington and London: Kennikat Press.
- Vance, James E. Jr. (1990). *Capturing the City: The Historical Geography of Transportation Since the Sixteenth Century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Warner Jr., Sam Bass (1962). *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and MIT Press.
- Whitt, J. Allen (1982). *Urban Elites and Mass Transportation: The Dialectics of Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wright, Charles L. (1992). *Slow Wheels, Fast Traffic: Urban Transport Choices*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zwerling, Stephen (1974). *Mass Transit and the Politics of Technology: A Study of BART and the San Francisco Bay Area*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

ESSAY 3: Can new transportation systems re-shape urban form?

Early in the quarter we traced the tandem evolution of transportation systems and urban form in U.S. metropolitan areas and saw a seemingly clear connection of cause and effect: new transportation technologies -- such as the electric streetcar and the automobile -- caused dramatic changes in the form and density of cities. This history of transportation cause and land use effect may cede significant power to transportation planners to shape cities. By introducing new or different transportation systems, can planners alter the form and density of cities in the future?

In recent efforts to alter the ongoing dispersion of metropolitan areas into sprawling auto-dependent suburbs, planners in cities around the U.S. have embarked on construction of new rail transit systems to "focus" growth and reduce auto use. The Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority, for example, is in the midst of an ambitious plan for a regional rail transit system that seeks to reconcentrate new development in downtown Los Angeles and around outlying stations.

In addition to the relevant required reading, you should carefully review the recommended readings for Topics 9, 10, and 11 and the optional readings for Topics 10 and 11 and, in light of class discussion and your own views, assess the links between new transportation systems and urban form. Under what conditions are transportation investments most likely to shape new development, and when and where are new transportation systems least likely to alter urban form? In general, do you think that the new rail

transit system proposed for Los Angeles will alter the prevailing development patterns in Southern California? If so, why? And if not, why not?

Due: Thursday, February 24th at Noon.

ESSAY 4: Will public transit investments lead to more "sustainable" cities?

Australians Newman and Kenworthy and American John Pucher have separately argued that planners and policy-makers in the U.S. have created less livable and sustainable cities than their counterparts in Europe and other parts of the developed world. A wide range of policies and planning practices, they argue, have combined to create sprawling, inefficient, energy consumptive, and polluted metropolitan areas in the U.S. American planners, they argue, should learn from cities in developed and developing countries elsewhere; policies that favor low-density development and dependence on the private automobile should be abandoned in favor more compact, higher density, and more transit-oriented developments.

Critics of these views, however, argue that most people prefer U.S.--style urban development and would vigorously resist attempts cut back on low-density development or significantly reduce automobile use. They point to data showing that development densities are declining and auto use is increasing faster in Europe and Asia than in the U.S. as evidence of the difficulty of slowing metropolitan dispersion or dampening the popularity of automobiles.

Your assignment is to carefully review all of the readings for Topic 12 and the required and optional readings for Topic 13 and assess the arguments of Newman & Kenworthy and Pucher and their critics. What are the principal issues to be considered? What evidence is available to support or refute the claims of each side? And, after weighing the issues and evidence, what position do you take?

Due: Thursday, March 9th at Noon.

ESSAY 5: Should planners balance jobs and housing in within metropolitan areas?

"Jobs-housing balancing" has for some time been a major issue in urban and regional policy. Some observers and regional policy-makers believe that a primary cause of worsening traffic congestion and air pollution in metropolitan areas is an imbalance of jobs and housing. They argue that work trips are lengthening at least in part because new residential areas are in outlying suburbs far from central job centers; the result is that some areas are jobs-rich and housing-poor, while others are housing-rich and jobs-poor. In 1989, for example, the Southern California Association of Governments and the South Coast Air Quality Management District both adopted plans calling for regional jobs-housing balancing policies as a means of reducing vehicle travel and traffic congestion.

Critics of such policies point out that there are many causes of increasing vehicle travel; the spatial distribution of jobs and housing may not be a significant contributor to traffic congestion. Further, critics argue that, even if all cities manage to balance jobs and housing, there is no guarantee that residents will choose to live and work in the same neighborhood.

Your assignment is to carefully review all of the readings for Topic 14 and assess the arguments for and against jobs-housing balance policies. What evidence is available to support or refute calls for planners to balance the distribution of jobs and housing in metropolitan areas? After weighing the issues and evidence, what position do you take? If you support a jobs-housing balance, how do you recommend planners implement such policies? If you oppose a jobs-housing balance, what transportation factors, if any, should planners consider locating new housing and commercial development?

Due: Thursday, March 9th, Noon.

ESSAY 6: Is there a "spatial mismatch" in cities?

Many analysts argue the persistent residential segregation of minorities (particularly African-Americans) in central cities has combined with the increasing suburbanization of metropolitan employment to create a "spatial mismatch," which has resulted in higher unemployment levels and longer commutes for central city minorities. Others contend that contribution of the spatial mismatch to minority unemployment and poverty has been exaggerated, that the issue centers much more on "race" and far less on "space."

Your assignment is to carefully review all of the readings in Topic 15 and assess the arguments for and against the spatial mismatch hypothesis. What are the principal issues to be considered? What evidence is available to support or refute the existence of a spatial mismatch? And, after weighing the issues and evidence, what position do you take?

Due: Thursday, March 9th, Noon.

ESSAY 7: Can neo-traditional and transit-oriented developments attract residents and reduce auto use?

The hot topic in land use planning and urban design circles these days is "neo-traditional development." These new designs -- espoused by architects Peter Calthorpe in California and Andres Duany in Florida -- call for a return to the medium-density, mixed-use urban developments of the streetcar era. They emphasize a human development scale, a pedestrian focus, and a mixing of homes, shops, offices, and apartments to encourage walking and transit use. Neo-traditional "urban villages" have recently been developed in Seaside, Florida, Gaithersburg, Maryland, and Sacramento, California.

Proponents of neo-traditionalism argue that such developments can significantly reduce auto dependence, while others are more skeptical. Even for residents, critics argue, neo-traditional villages are just small parts of the much larger geographic areas where most people live, work, and play. Further, neo-traditional developments are not consistent with the life-styles favored by most Americans and, therefore, will appeal only to a minority of urban residents.

Your assignment is to carefully review all of the readings for Topic 17 and evaluate the promise of neo-traditional development to (1) attract residents and businesses and (2) to reduce vehicle travel. What are the principal issues to be considered? What evidence is available to support or refute the claims of neo-traditionalists? And, after weighing the issues and evidence, would you favor a shift toward neo-traditionalism in Southern California?

Due: Thursday, March 16th, Noon.