DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS **UCLA**

PP 220/UP 254 **Fall 2006**

TRANSPORTATION, LAND USE, AND URBAN FORM

When?

Days/Times:	Tuesdays and Thursdays, 9:00 am to 10:20 am
Field Trip:	Friday, November 3rd, 8:30 am to 6:00 pm
Final Exam Review:	Tuesday, December 12th, 9:00 am to 10:30 am
Final Exam:	Thursday, December 14th, 9:00 am to 10:30 am

Where?

Room:	2238 Public Policy Building

Who?

Instructor:	Brian Taylor
Office:	5383 Public Policy Building
Appointments:	www.its.ucla.edu/its/hours
Email:	btaylor@ucla.edu
Telephone:	310.903.3228

Reader:	Eric Morris
Email:	ericmorris3@gmail.com
Telephone:	818-625-3987
Office Hours:	TBA

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.

The content of the course is divided into four 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. The third part examines a number of land use and transportation policy questions facing planners today. And the fourth part explores the normative perspectives and values shaping our views of cities and their transportation systems.

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 introduction of the automobile and its implications for urban form.
- The alleged 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

- 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.
- Transportation and new urbanism.
- Transportation, urban form, and public health

Part Four

- Theories of good and bad urban form.
- Current trends in travel and urban development.
- Cars, density, and values.
- The road ahead.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There are no formal prerequisites for the course, although prior course work in urban geography and/or urban economics is helpful. There are five parts to the course: (1) lectures and class discussion, (2) reading assignments, (3) written assignments, (4) a daylong field trip, and (5) 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 come from two sources: a course reader and a text, *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, 3rd Edition, edited by Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano; both are available at the bookstore under Lu Valle Commons (310.825.4014). Many of the recommended and optional readings, as well as *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, will be available through Graduate Reserve at the Young 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: two analytical memoranda and a critical essay. These assignments have staggered due dates timed to correspond with the subject areas covered in class. The analytical memoranda ask you and a partner to analyze some data pertaining to a land use/transportation issue and prepare a short (6 to 8 page) analysis in memo form. 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 essay on the topic. All written assignments should be submitted to Eric Morris' 3rd floor Public Policy Building mailbox by the due date and time.

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, November 3rd. In consideration of the extra time required for this field trip, class will not meet at its regularly scheduled time on Thursday, November 9th. Any student unable to participate in the field trip will be required to complete a second critical essay.

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 Thursday, December 14th from 9:00 am to 10:30 am. To help you prepare for the exam, there will be an optional final exam review session on Tuesday, December 12th from 9:00 am to 10:30 am.

Grading. Course grades will be based on the following:

• Analytical Memo 1	15 percent
• Analytical Memo 2	15 percent
• Critical Essay	25 percent
• Final Examination	35 percent
• Attendance/participation	10 percent
• 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 1. Overview of Course. (9/28)

No reading.

TOPIC 2. Issues and Concepts in Urban Transportation Planning. (10/3)

Required

Hanson, Susan. 2004. "The Context of Urban Travel: Concepts and Recent Trends," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 3-29.

Wachs, Martin. 1993. "Learning from Los Angeles: Transport, Urban Form, and Air Quality," *Transportation*, 20: 329-353.

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

TOPIC 3. The Tandem Evolution of Transportation Systems and Urban Form. (10/3 and 10/5)

Required

Muller, Peter O. 2004. "Transportation and Urban Form: Stages in the Spatial Evolution of the American Metropolis," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 59-85.

Recommended

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

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.

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.

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 4. The Evolution and Planning of Public Transportation in U.S. Cities. (10/10 and 10/12)

Required

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

Recommended

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: 149-174.

Optional

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

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

TOPIC 5. Was There a Conspiracy to Destroy Public Transit in Los Angeles? (10/12)

Required

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

Slater, Cliff. 1997. “General Motors and the Demise of Streetcars,” *Transportation Quarterly*, 51(3): 45-66.

Recommended

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.

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): 51-86.

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

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

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, MA: Ballinger. Pages 31-48.

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.

Taylor, Brian D. 2002. "Transportation: *Taken for a Ride*, *Tango 73 – A Bus Rider's Diary*, *Modern Transportation Management*," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68(3): 337-339.

TOPIC 6. The Introduction of the Automobile and the Evolution and Planning of Streets and Highways in U.S. Cities. (10/17, 10/19, and 10/24)

Required

McShane, Clay. 1994. "The Internal Combustion Automobile," in *Down the Asphalt Path: the Automobile and the American City.* New York: Columbia University Press. Pages 103-125, 251-255.

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

Taylor, Brian D. 2000. "When Finance Leads Planning: Urban Planning, Highway Planning, and Metropolitan Freeways," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 20(2): 196-214.

Recommended

McShane, Clay. 1994. *Down the Asphalt Path: the Automobile and the American City.* New York: Columbia University Press.

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

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 7. Evolution of Transportation Planning Policies and Institutions. (10/26)

Required

Wachs, Martin (2004). “Reflections on the Planning Process,” in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 141-162.

Recommended

Meyer, Michael and Eric Miller (2001). "Transportation Planning and Decision Making," *Urban Transportation Planning*, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pages 41-88.

Meyer, Michael and Eric Miller (2001). "Urban Transportation Planning: Definition and Context," *Urban Transportation Planning*, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pages 1-40.

Optional

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.

Part Two

TOPIC 8. Transportation, Intra-Metropolitan Location Theory, and Urban Form. (10/31)

Required

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.

Glaeser, Edward L., Matthew E. Kahn and Jordan Rappaport (2000). “Why Do The Poor Live In Cities?” Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper 1891. Pages 1-29. Available at <http://www.economics.harvard.edu/hier/2000papers/HIER1891.pdf>.

Recommended

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.

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.

TOPIC 9. The Land Use Effects of Transportation Policies. (11/2)

Required

Giuliano, Genevieve (2004). "Land Use Impacts of Transportation Investments: Highway and Transit," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 237-273.

Cervero, Robert. 2003. "Are Induced Travel Studies Inducing Bad Investments?" *Access*, 22, Spring, 22-27.

Recommended

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 Decision making," *TR News*, 187. Pages 16-17.

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.

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.

Optional

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

TOPIC 10. The Transportation Effects of Land Use Policies. (11/2)

Required

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Remedies That Increase Densities," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 200-227.

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Concentrating Jobs in Large Clusters," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 245-257.

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Local Growth Management Policies," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 258-271.

Recommended

Crane, Randall. 2000. "The Influence of Urban Form on Travel: An Interpretive Review," *Journal of Planning Literature,* 15(1): 3-23.

Optional

Bae, Chang-Hee Christine. 2001. "Technology Vs. Land Use: Alternative Strategies to Reduce Auto-related Air Pollution," *Planning and Markets*, 4(1): 1-20.

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

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.

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.

Part Three

TOPIC 11. Transportation and Urban Form: International Comparisons. (11/7)

Required

Newman, Peter and Jeffrey Kenworthy. 1999. "The pattern of automobile dependence and global cities," in *Sustainability and cities: Overcoming automobile dependence*. Washington, DC: Island Press. Pages 68-127.

Bertaud, Alain. 2002. "Clearing the Air in Atlanta: Transit and Smart Growth or Conventional Economics?" Available online at <http://alain-bertaud.com/images/AB_Clearing_The_Air_in%20Atlanta_1.pdf>.

Recommended

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.

Optional

Kenworthy, Jeffrey R., and Felix B. Laube. 1999. "Patterns of automobile dependence in cities: an international overview of key physical and economic dimensions with some implications for urban policy," *Transportation Research, Part A*, 33: 691-723.

Kenworthy, Jeffery R., Felix B. Laube, with Peter Newman, et al. 1999. *An international sourcebook of automobile dependence in cities, 1960-1990.* Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

TOPIC 12: Transportation, Urban Form, and Public Policy: International Comparisons. (11/7)

Required

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Traffic Congestion around the World," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 272-297.

Committee for an International Comparison of National Policies and Expectations Affecting Public Transit. 2001. "Transit Use, Automobility, and Urban Form: Comparative Trends and Patterns," *Making Transit Work: Insight from Western Europe, Canada, and the United States*. Transportation Research Board Special Report 257. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Pages 17-64.

Recommended

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.

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

Martec Group (2002). "Martec White Paper" Fuel Economy: A Critical Assessment of Public Policy in the US vs. the EU. April 2002.

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.

Optional

Committee for an International Comparison of National Policies and Expectations Affecting Public Transit. 2001. "Policies and Practices Favorable to Transit in Western Europe and Canada," *Making Transit Work: Insight from Western Europe, Canada, and the United States*. Transportation Research Board Special Report 257. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Pages 65-113.

Committee for an International Comparison of National Policies and Expectations Affecting Public Transit. 2001. "External Policies and Factors Affecting Transit Use," *Making Transit Work: Insight from Western*

Europe, Canada, and the United States. Transportation Research Board Special Report 257. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Pages 114-147.

TOPIC 13: Is the Metropolitan Balance of Jobs and Housing a Transportation Issue? (11/14)

Required

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

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Changing the Jobs-Housing Balance," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 228-244.

Recommended

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

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

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

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.

TOPIC 14. The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis. (11/16)

Required

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

Blumenberg, Evelyn (2004). "En-gendering Effective Planning: Spatial Mismatch, Low-Income Women, and Transportation Policy," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(3): 269-281.

Recommended

Blumenberg, Evelyn and Michael Manville (forthcoming). "Beyond the Spatial Mismatch Welfare Recipients, Spatial Barriers to Employment, and Transportation Policy," *Journal of Planning Literature*.

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

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.

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

Optional

Blumenberg, Evelyn and Margy Waller (2003). "The Long Journey to Work: A Federal Transportation Policy for Working Families," Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, July. <http//www.brookings.edu/metro/publications/20030801_waller.htm>.

Burton, Elizabeth (2000). "The Compact City: Just or Just Compact? A Preliminary Analysis," *Urban Studies*, 37(11): 1969-2001.

Deka, Devajyoti (2004). Social and Environmental Justice Issues in Urban Transportation, in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 332-355.

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," *Urban Studies,* 32:9, November, pages 1537-1557.

TOPIC 15: Urban Design and Travel Behavior. (11/21)

Required

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

Southworth, Michael and Eran Ben-Joseph. 2004. "Reconsidering the Cul-de-sac," *Access*, 24: 28-33.

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

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

Recommended

Knack, Ruth. 1998. "Drive Nicely: Looking for Ways to Beat Road Rage? Try Traffic Calming," *Planning*, December: 12-15.

Landis, John and Robert Cervero. 1999. "Middle-Age Sprawl: BART and Urban Development," *Access*, 14: 11-15.

Optional

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.

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

TOPIC 16: New Urbanism and Transportation. (11/21)

Required

Dunphy, Robert. (1995). "Transit-Oriented Development: Making a Difference?" *Urban Land*, July: 32-36.

Pickrell, Don (1998). "Smart Transportation for Smart Growth," *Smart Growth: Economy, Community, Environment*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute. Pages 12-19.

Recommended

Audirac, Ivonne and Anne H. Shermyen (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.

Berman, Michael Aaron (1996). "The Transportation Effects of Neo-Traditional Development," Journal of Planning Literature, 10(4): 347-363.

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.

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.

Optional

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

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

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.

TOPIC 17: Transportation, Urban Form, and Public Health (11/28)

Required

Transportation Research Board/National Institute of Medicine of the National Academies Committee on Physical Activity, Health, Transportation, and Land Use. 2005. "Current State of Knowledge,*" Does the Built Environment Influence Physical Activity? Examining the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board. Pages 151-218. Available online at <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr282.pdf>.

Recommended

Transportation Research Board/National Institute of Medicine of the National Academies Committee on Physical Activity, Health, Transportation, and Land Use. 2005. "Executive Summary*," Does the Built Environment Influence Physical Activity? Examining the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board. Pages 1-15. Available online at <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr282.pdf>.

Optional

Transportation Research Board/National Institute of Medicine of the National Academies Committee on Physical Activity, Health, Transportation, and Land Use. 2005. *Does the Built Environment Influence Physical Activity? Examining the Evidence*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board. Pages 1-248.

Journal of the American Planning Association special issue on urban form and physical activity, 72:1, Winter 2006. Available online through the UCLA library.

Part Four

TOPIC 18. Emerging Trends in Travel, Urban Development, and Planning. (11/30)

Required

Crane, Randall and Daniel G. Chatman. 2003. "As Jobs Sprawl, Whither the Commute?" *Access*, 23: 14-19.

Janelle, Donald G. (2004). "Impact of Information Technologies," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 86-112.

Recommended

Lang, Robert E. and Simmons, Patrick A. 2001. *"Boomburbs:" The Emergence of Large, Fast-Growing Suburban Cities in the United States*, Census Note 06. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Foundation.

Dunphy, Robert 1997. "Demographics, Changing Preferences, and Travel," *Moving Beyond Gridlock: Traffic and Development*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Land Institute. Pages 27-38.

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.

Optional

Clark, William A. V. and Marianne Kuijpers-Linde (1994). "Commuting in Restructuring Regions," *Urban Studies*, 31:3, pages 465-483.Frey, William H. (1993). "The New Urban Revival in the United States," *Urban Studies*, 30:4/5. Pages 741-774.

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.

TOPIC 19. Sprawl and Normative Theory: Are There "Good" and "Bad" Urban Forms? (12/5)

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

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.

Optional

Burchell, Robert W., et al. 1998. *Costs of sprawl – 2000,* TCRP Report 74. Washington, DC: Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board. 605 pages.

Burchell, Robert W., et al. 1998. *Costs of sprawl revisited*, TCRP Report 39. Washington, DC: Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board. 268 pages.

TOPIC 20: Cars, Density, and Values. (12/5)

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

Dittmar, Hank (1995). "A Broader Context for Transportation Planning: Not Just an End in Itself," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 61(1): 7-13.

TOPIC 21: The Road Ahead. (12/7)

Required

Taylor, Brian D. 2006. "Putting a Price on Mobility: Cars and Contradictions in Planning," Longer View, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72(3): 279-284.

Giuliano, Genevieve and Susan Hanson (2004). "Managing the Auto," in *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, Third Edition, Susan Hanson and Genevieve Giuliano, Editors. New York: The Guilford Press. Pages 382-403.

Recommended

Downs, Anthony (2004). "Regional Anticongestion Policies," in *Still Stuck in Traffic: Coping with Peak-Hour Traffic Congestion.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Pages 298-320.

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

All of the written assignments for this course are detailed below. You are required to complete (1) two of the seven analytical memoranda (conducted in teams of two) and (2) any one of the seven critical essay assignments (on your own). 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 will be applied to any papers turned in after the due dates listed above. All written assignments (hardcopy only) should be turned into Eric Morris' mailbox on the third floor of the Public Policy Building by the due date and time.

ANALYTICAL MEMO

Please complete two of the following seven assignments. Your first analytical memorandum is due on Monday, November 6th at noon. Your second analytical memorandum is due on Monday, December 11th at noon. The memos should run six to eight pages of double-spaced text plus tables, charts, maps, illustrations, appendices, and bibliography as appropriate. Work in groups of two: memos will not be accepted from individuals.

You Should Complete Either A, B, C, or D Below

MEMO A: How does urban form influence travel behavior?

You are staff to the House Transportation and Public Works Committee. Last summer several of the committee members went on a junket to Europe and Asia to do "first-hand" research on the transportation systems in Eurasian cities. Several members concluded from this trip that promulgating legislation encouraging cities to increase population and/or employment densities would significantly increase transit use and substantially reduce auto dependence. Other members, however, argue that land use control is and should be a local issue. They argue instead that legislation should be promulgated to significantly increase investment in public transit systems and decrease investment in highways. This, argue the dissenters, will help to gradually transform sprawling American cities into the more compact, dense cities of Europe and Asia. Finally, some members feel that neither method is feasible; in their opinion, either policy would be costly to implement and ineffective given the existing spatial configuration of American cities.

Your boss (the lead staff person to the committee) is concerned about promulgating legislation to encourage density or promote transit use without a clearer understanding of the causal links between urban form and travel behavior. She has asked you and your partner to analyze the relationship between urban form and transportation using data from the widely-cited 1999 sourcebook by Newman and Kenworthy, which provides various measures of urban form and transportation in a sample of 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 tested 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 analysis 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 for the House Transportation and Public Works Committee. Because so much data are provided, you must decide (and defend) which variables are of the greatest interest, and focus you investigations on them.

For each relationship you examine, write a clear statement of the hypothesis you test, report on your visual analysis of the data (including comments on outliers), report on the calculated correlation coefficients, present your theory about the direction of causality when correlations are significant, and provide a written commentary on whether the analysis supports or does 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 read in class.

MEMO B: TOD in Omaha?

You are a community development specialist for Omaha, Nebraska. Recently, debates about sprawl have become increasingly contentious in your city. A developer has come forward with a transit-oriented development proposal that he claims will help to address the problem of sprawl. He tells the mayor that research has proven that a combination of high-density housing, mixed land uses, and good quality public transit will decrease auto ownership, auto use, and air pollution by increased transit, walking, and biking. Being a smart woman, the mayor has her staff conduct some preliminary research; she learns that the studies conducted to date are far from clear on the question of transit-oriented development and travel behavior. She asks that you follow-up on this preliminary literature scan by writing a memorandum to address the following questions and issues:

1. How is residential density measured in studies of travel behavior and urban form? (Hint: look to some of the studies on this topic in the syllabus as a start) Are some measures better than others? What is the residential density of Omaha? Is it higher or lower than Los Angeles? Atlanta? What about other regions? Given that residential density varies significantly within most metropolitan areas, how well do such aggregate measures of residential density reflect urban form?

2. In research that has empirically demonstrated a difference in the amount of auto travel between dense urban areas and "sprawled" regions, what is the magnitude of the difference? That is, by how much do proponents of denser developments claim to reduce travel? Why should we believe or not believe these claims?

3. Does Omaha show the expected relationship between aggregate density and aggregate travel? How does it compare to places that are known for transit-oriented development, like Portland or San Diego, or those places that are characterized as sprawling, like Atlanta or Houston?

The mayor wants to see the numbers. Relevant census data are available at http://www.mapacog.org/links.htm. Also, the National Transportation Data Archive: http://www.bts.gov/ntda/ has relevant travel information as well.

Make sure in your memo to give the Mayor quantitative data to support your findings. She's a financial analyst and gets really mad when she thinks the city's planners aren't showing the bottom line. But she is going to need some interpretation since she's not a planner. Finally, you might find it helpful to draw on the required and supplementary readings for Topics 14 and 15 if they help you focus your questions or buttress your findings.

MEMO C: Los Angeles Style Sprawl?

California's high-profile new Governor has promised to eliminate pork barrel projects across the state. Specifically, he has threatened to "terminate" all funding for new road construction projects in Los Angeles County because he has been told by some activists that adding new roads to congested areas will only make matters worse given LA's reputation as the sprawl capital of the world and Angelino's well-known love affair with the automobile.

You work for the Southern California Association of Governments and have been asked by your boss to write up a memo responding to the Governor's criticisms of LA as excessively sprawling and auto-dependant as justifications for his road termination threat. In your memo you should analyze and synthesize the UP 254 course readings on the relationships between urban form and travel behavior in Los Angeles and elsewhere. Second, you should present your analysis of data comparing the population densities, average vehicle-miles traveled, and congestion levels in Los Angeles to that of other cities around the country (these data are available through the UP 254 class website through the link Memo Topic C). Based on your understanding of the relationship between road building and sprawl, and your analysis of the data, do you agree with the Governor's assessment that Los Angeles is a sprawling, auto-dominated city needing to be reigned in by a moratorium on road projects?

Make sure your memo provides the Governor with quantitative data to support your conclusions. Additionally, you should offer specific recommendations to the Governor, based on your findings and on the theories you have developed from the material that has been presented in class. Cite sources when you feel they are important for your case. If you find it helpful for developing your argument, you may want to look at SCAG's 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtp2001/2004draft/FinalPlan.htm) to review what types of projects your agency supports and critique some of these projects based on their ability to cost-effectively reduce congestion and improve mobility within Los Angeles. How you believe that transportation funds should be spent in Los Angeles County?

MEMO D: 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.

Your assignment is to create a 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 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.

You Should Complete Either E, F, or G Below

MEMO E: A Desire Named Streetcar

Recently, the League of Concerned Taxpaying Motorists and the Association of Annoyed Bus Riders in San Diego filed suit against the San Diego Light Rail and Bus Administration (LRBA), arguing that the LRBA's rail-building activities have consumed an unfair portion of the region's transit budget. In particular, they argue that LRBA have habitually inflated the forecasted ridership associated with rail in order to "roll" the benefit-cost evaluation of rail projects in their favor. This contention was found sufficiently believable by the courts, and it is issued a permanent injunction on rail construction by the LRBA. The construction of light rail projects in San Diego have ground to a halt.

You are a planning consultant with the Environmentalists' Club in San Diego. This organization is planning to file a countersuit against the injunction, arguing that without rail, the San Diego area will be doomed to poor air quality and sprawl. Your boss is convinced that the errors in forecasting made by the LRBA are simply normal errors in forecasting, and he wants you to go out and survey the evidence on new rail starts. Table 1 shows the history of LRBA's previous forecasts. During the first phase of the lawsuit, the LRBA provided the estimates of how many new riders they had attracted to the transit system by providing more and better rail. But the State Auditor found that much of the new ridership claimed by the LRBA were actually transit riders who were diverted to rail from existing bus lines, due to planning changes made by LRBA.

		Daily Boardings		Percent New Riders	
Link	Length	Forecast 2000	Actual 2000	LRBA Estimate	Audit
Elbow Line	11.5	15,800	9,300	53%	17%
Big Toe Line	1	10,000	6,912	40%	32%
Liver Line	5.6	21,000	13,000	34%	39%
Hypothalamus Line	8.1	12,000	9,890	25%	8%

1. How do the errors in forecasting at the LRBA stack up against the errors found by Pickrell's 1990s study of rail forecasting (on reserve for this assignment) and Bent Flyvbjerg, Mette K. Skamris Holm, and Soren L. Buhl's study in the Journal of the American Planning Association vol. 71 #2, Spring 2005 issue (available online through the UCLA library system)? Are LRBA's errors about the same, lower, or larger than those found by these authors? Show the evidence in a table.

2. The lead attorney wants you to construct a table of daily boardings, new riders, and new riders per mile of other recently constructed rail systems in at least two other cities. The attorney wants you should consider how these cities differ from San Diego Also, he wants you to interpret your findings: did these other new light rail starts do better or worse than LRBA?

MEMO F: The Costs of Sprawl

You are an associate planner for the Metropolitan Council in Minneapolis-St. Paul. The Minneapolis-St. Paul region has exemplified progressive regional governance, having enabled regional property-tax sharing and other measures explicitly designed to increase cooperative regional governance aimed at decreasing sprawl, among other governmental failures.

One day, the director of the Metropolitan Council comes into your office with blood in his eyes waving a Wall Street Journal article that lists Minneapolis-St. Paul as "one of the most sprawling cities of the U.S." The article cites a report called *The Costs of Sprawl* (TCRP Report #74), available online. In Appendix E of the report, the authors have created a series of composite variables that are then used to calculate a "composite sprawl index." The ratings of this new report show that the Twin Cities have the 34th

highest (most sprawling) score, way above places like Las Vegas (#141), Los Angeles (#150), and Phoenix (#151)! In fact, the 2nd lowest city in the sprawl index is San Jose – where you lived for several years. San Jose! You moved from San Jose to the Twin Cities partly because you saw that Silicon Valley city as the apotheosis of auto-oriented development and dismal-looking tract housing that many people associate with sprawl.

Your supervisor would like you to write him a memo that:

1. Describes the method for creating the index and rankings in a concise—and nontechnical—manner so that he can explain it to the mayor. The method for creating the sprawl index is laid out in the report text (which is both available online and is on reserve for UP 254).

2. Evaluates the index in terms of its explanatory power. That is, does the index measure what it claims to measure? Is it a good basis for evaluating sprawl? Your supervisor suggests that you use the data from Appendix D of the report on population and land areas to construct simpler measures of residential density for both inside and outside the central city. Then rank those. How do these measures correspond to the composite sprawl indices in Appendix E? Construct a table of the top and bottom ten for the simple measure you have constructed and the composite measures. Which is more believable?

3. A few days go by, and one of your smart coworkers says in front of the supervisor, "Hey, that composite sprawl index only considers how autos can disperse land uses. Bus rapid transit or rail can spread land uses, too, especially when combined with park-and-ride facilities. Is that anywhere in the index?" Your supervisor likes this question, and wants you to discuss this in the memo. Do any of the indicator variables used in the index control for the possibility that *any* motorized transit can disperse human activity? Why should this problem with the index concern us? Or shouldn't it? How do you think transit should be factored in to measures of sprawl?

4. Finally, given your research and the data from the Costs of Sprawl study, what would you propose as a reasonable way to measure sprawl? Be specific and show how the results of your sprawl index would rank Minneapolis, San Jose, and ten other cities of your choice.

MEMO G: Land Use, Transportation, and Poverty: The Determining Factor

You work for an advocacy group in Washington D.C. whose mission is to empower low-income households by helping them get jobs. In the past few years, a growing number of academics have supported the idea of providing low-income households with cars to lower barriers to job access. Your boss is intrigued by the concept, but has her reservations about promoting auto use, as she is an active member of the Sierra Club.

Because you are familiar with the spatial mismatch literature, your boss has asked you to delve into some data from the 2001 National Household Transportation Study to determine whether vehicle access or residential location is a greater determinant in whether or not household members are employed. To answer this question, you will need to download the 2001 dataset from the NHTS website (http://nhts.ornl.gov/2001/html_files/download_directory.shtml). The households file variable "HHR_WRKR" states whether or not the household respondent is employed. The variable "URBAN" lists whether a household is located in the central city (1), in suburb (2), in an exurb (3) or in a rural area (4). The variable "HHVEHCNT" lists the household vehicles. You may analyze the data in any way you wish – means, medians, frequencies, crosstabs, or regressions are all excellent ways to convey your findings to your boss, as long as you can explain their meaning in a way that she, who has had no formal training in statistics, can understand.

Be sure to incorporate your findings as tables or figures in a well-written, concise memo. Also, relate your findings to the spatial mismatch literature and any other readings from the class that you find relevant. Based on your results, should your group promote providing low-income households with automobiles? Or is there another policy avenue that you believe should be explored?

Note that if you choose to write on this topic you should not do Critical Essay #5.

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 seven 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 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: What Killed Transit in the American City?

From the horsecar through the streetcar, transit had a fifty year head start on the automobile. The infrastructure was in place, it was familiar to riders and land use patterns had evolved around it. Yet the automobile quickly took over and transit went

into a long and precipitous decline. Why? Was it due to the technological merits of the two competing modes? Or was it because of failings in the way transit was implemented, managed, regulated and run? Did social and cultural factors play an important role? Were political or planning issues the key? Discuss what you consider to be the most important factors. Do not simply list every possible explanation; select the causes you feel were decisive and build a case to support your analysis. You may also wish to consider some commonly given explanations you feel were not of real importance in transit's demise.

Your assignment is carefully review all of the readings for Topic 5 and the required readings for Chapter 6. You might also find some sections of the Clay McShane book *Down the Asphalt Path: the Automobile and the American City* useful; it will be on reserve. Conclude the paper by speculating on what history can teach us as we try to promote transit anew today. Does our past experience show transit is just not suited for the American city? Or if we correct some specific failings, can we get transit right this time around?

Due: Monday, October 30th at Noon.

ESSAY 2: Book review.

Listed below are 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 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: Monday, November 6th 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.

Brodsly, David (1981). *L.A. Freeway: An Appreciative Essay*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Cervero, Robert (1986). *Suburban Gridlock*. New Brunswick: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Randall Crane and Marlon Boarnet (2000). *Travel by Design: The Influence of Urban Form on Travel.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Cudahy, Brian J. (1990). *Cash, Tokens, and Transfers: A History of Urban Mass Transit in North America*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Davies, Pete. (2002). *American Road: The Story of an Epic Transcontinental Journey at the Dawn of the Motor Age.* New York: Henry Holt.

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.

Kenworthy, Jeffery R., Felix B. Laube, with Peter Newman, et al. 1999. *An international sourcebook of automobile dependence in cities, 1960-1990.* Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

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.

McShane, Clay (1994). *Down the Asphalt Path: the Automobile and the American City.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mogridge, Martin J. H. (1990). *Travel in Towns: Jam Yesterday, Jam Today, and Jam Tomorrow?*. London and Basingstoke: McMillian Reference Books.

Newman, Peter and Jeffrey Kenworthy. 1999. *Sustainability and cities: Overcoming automobile dependence*. Washington, DC: Island Press. Pages 68-127.

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.

Pucher, John and Christian Lefevre (1996). *The Urban Transport Crisis in Europe and North America*. London: Macmillan

Richmond, Jonathan (2004). *Transport of Delight: The Mythical Conception of Rail Transit in Los Angeles*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

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.

Sutter, P.S. and W. Cronin. (2002). *Driven Wild: How the Fight Against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement*. University of Washington 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.

Vuchic, Vukan R. (1999). *Transportation for Livable Cities*. New Brunswick: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

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 7, 8, and 9, skim the optional readings for these topics, 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: Monday, November 13th 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 the required and recommended readings for Topic 10 and the required, recommended and optional readings for Topic 11 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: Monday, November 20th 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 <u>all</u> of the readings for Topic 13 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: Monday, November 27th at 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 14 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: Monday, November 27th at 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 Topics 15 and 16 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: Monday, December 4th at Noon.