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Tony Sparks
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Introduction

Since 1979, Urban Action has published a myriad of student articles, as well as poems and photo essays that paint an elaborate picture of urban issues from the past 35 years. Issues brought up in earlier editions, such as gentrification and the provision of adequate affordable housing, remains highly polarized today.

As these issues have moved throughout modern history, they are constantly being recorded in academic literature throughout the world. This particular Urban Action issue strives to record similar ideals and theories that are unique in nature, and are not nailed down by scholarly dogma for which many students must abide to.

That being said, our talented editorial team chose articles that provide a mix of philosophical thought and that of academic literacy, where a student can freely express their opinions with proper citations when necessary, or not at all. Our authors are valued students who have great insight regarding urbanism and necessary policy and planning provisions to make cities livable for all. Their contribution to this year’s Urban Action is well regarded by our editorial staff for their insight and relevancy to modern and sustainable planning practices.

In addition this publication also includes work from students with an excellent background in urban design. Our design team has worked hard to portray our student’s artwork and designs, as well as formatting the journal in a way that highlights the concepts of our authors, our editors, and myself.

We hope you enjoy reading Urban Action 2014.
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Multimodal Livability Along the 8X Corridor

Henry Pan

Abstract

This paper discusses the Transit Time Reduction Proposals (TTRP) for the 8X-Bayshore Express corridor outlined in the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). The corridor covers Geneva between Ocean/Phelan and Santos Street in Daly City, Santos Street between Geneva Ave. in Daly City to Sunnydale Ave. in San Francisco, Sunnydale Avenue between Santos Street and Hahn Street, Hahn between Sunnydale and Visitacion Ave., Visitacion between Hahn and Bayshore Blvd., Bayshore between Visitacion and Arleta/San Bruno Ave., and San Bruno between Silver and Bayshore. My group included Sophia Rodriguez (SFSU, B.A. Geography SP2014), who researched the moderate and expanded alternatives with respect to demographics, transit impacts, and capacity utilization; and Eli Pontecorvo (SFSU, B.A. Geography SP2014), who researched Level of Service (LOS) on the corridor. I researched existing bicycle, pedestrian, and parking conditions, and how the TEP TTRP will affect these modes. This paper is organized as follows: I will first discuss the demographics and travel behavior profile. I will then discuss existing bicycling, pedestrian, and parking conditions along the 8X corridor. Next, I will discuss the TTRP proposals, as well as their impacts on bicycling, pedestrian, and parking. Finally, I will evaluate the project’s effectiveness and relate it to other planning projects happening in the routes’ vicinity, with recommendations to make this project more beneficial for bicyclists and pedestrians, as well as to better manage parking.

The 8X-Bayshore Express is an express bus route operated by the SFMTA. It serves Chinatown, North Beach, Downtown, South of Market, Portola, Visitacion Valley, Crocker-Amazon, Excelsior, Outer Mission, and Oceanview neighborhoods. It currently has 23,000 boardings per day (SFMTA, n.d.a). When the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) was first proposed for the route, it called for enhanced route legibility. This was implemented in December 2009, when the 9X was renumbered into the 8X and rerouted away from Rutland and Arleta in the inbound direction to allow it to continue down Visitacion from Rutland to Bayshore (Rhodes, 2009). The 8AX was realigned to operate between Kearny/Pacific and Geneva/Schwerin, while the 8BX operates between City College and Fisherman’s Wharf but enters the freeway at the Bayshore/3rd interchange. Phase 2 of the TEP changes is referred to the TTRP, which involves more infrastructure changes. They are concentrated in the segment between San Bruno/Silver and the Phelan Loop, as shown in Figure 1.

Demographics

The demographics examined include race, age, education, car ownership, and journey to work. The neighborhoods being examined encompass the 8X route and include the Outer Mission, Excelsior (which includes Portola), Crocker-Amazon, and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods. For the purposes of this paper, only vehicle availability and journey to work are evaluated.
to the City, indicating low transit dependency. It should be noted that these neighborhoods are less dense and thus necessitate driving. Figure 3 displays journey-to-work patterns confirming this deduction. Despite low vehicle availability relative to the rest of the city, driving to work is the dominant commute mode. While these neighborhoods are consistent with the city that they all have high driving mode share, and that the transit mode share is consistent, these four neighborhoods have disproportionately high automobile usage. Generally speaking, it can be attributed to the suburban arrangement of these neighborhoods characterized by dispersed goods and services, as well as inadequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Such spatial arrangement forces many residents to drive.

**Existing Conditions**

This section discusses existing conditions of bicycle, pedestrian, and parking on the corridor, as well as the fieldwork conducted. Fieldwork on the corridor was conducted on the following dates: September 6, 2013 (inbound walk, 2pm-5pm), October 8, 2013 (outbound bike ride, 2:45pm-3:30pm) and October 18, 2013 (inbound bike ride, 2:12pm-2:50pm).

**Bicycling Conditions**

Figure 4 shows the bike routes that operate along the corridor. The 8X operates concurrently with three major bike routes. It operates with Bicycle Route 25, which runs on San Bruno Avenue between Paul and Bayshore/Arleta; Bicycle Route 5, which runs on Bayshore between Arleta and Visitacion; and Bicycle Route 90, which runs between Santos and Ocean. Only Bicycle Route 90 is mentioned in the TEP Draft Environmental Impact Report. Fieldwork for this involved bicycling the corridor. The outbound 8X route was biked on October 8th, and the inbound 8X route was biked on October 18th. It takes 15 more minutes to bike outbound than inbound, mainly because of the hills.

Bike route 25 on San Bruno has Class III bike facilities (sharrows only) between Paul and Mansell (although that is slated to be upgraded to Class II bike lanes in the near future, regardless of the TEP (SFMTA, 2013b, 8-9)) and Campbell and Bayshore/Arleta. But as shown in Figure 5, Class II bike lanes currently exist between...
Mansell and Campbell Streets. During fieldwork observations, five bicyclists were observed riding on the corridor over a 2-hour period; two of whom were riding on the sidewalk. It is also known that the San Francisco to Google (SF2G) bicycle convoy uses this segment to get to the Peninsula ("Bayway").

Bike Route 5 runs concurrently with the 8X on Bayshore between San Bruno and Visitacion. There are Class II bike lanes in both directions throughout Bayshore. The bike lanes straddle between traffic lanes and a parking lane between Arleta and Leland. South of Leland, the bike lanes occupy what normally would be parking. During fieldwork observations, no bicyclists used this facility.

On Geneva, Bicycle Route 90 runs from Santos Street to Ocean Avenue and the Phelan Loop (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-12). There are Class II facilities on Geneva between Mission and Prague and Brookdale and Santos. However, for a two-block stretch between Edinburgh and Vienna (shown in Figure 6), as well as a one-block stretch between Cielito and Esquina in the westbound direction, there are no bike lanes. While these blocks are not signed as Class III routes, these routes do exist between Ocean and France, and Prague to Brookdale. Prague to Brookdale is most concerning, especially in the uphill (west) direction. Sharing a lane with high-speed traffic is dangerous and could be potentially deadly. Bicyclists must either ride on the one foot available in the parking lane that is within the door zone as shown in Figure 7, or illegally (unless under 13) on the sidewalk (as shown in Figure 8) (San Francisco Transportation Code, 2013). Sharrows are not preferable on an arterial, since it is intimidating for the novice bicyclist. Due to unsafe conditions on Geneva, only one

Figure 5: A Class II Bicycle Facility on San Bruno Avenue, part of Bicycle Route 25. Author Photo.

Figure 6: These Google Earth aerial imagery show a gap in the Class II Bicycle Facility on Geneva between Vienna and Edinburgh. Bike lanes were enhanced to clarify existing placement. Source: Google Earth

Figure 7: Riding up Geneva, part of Bicycle Route 90, between Brookdale and Prague. This segment is a designated Class III bike route. Because it is unsafe to ride with traffic, one can ride within the door zone. Author Photo
other bicyclist was observed during a fieldwork observation, and only in the inbound direction. Bicycle Route 90 is the only bike route on the corridor that is mentioned in the DEIR, because it is the only bike route on the corridor being evaluated for infrastructure improvements.

There are other corridors that the 8X operates on that currently lack bike facilities and are not designated as bicycle routes. However, the terrain is flat enough to allow for novice bicyclists to ride. The corridors are Visitacion between Hahn and Bayshore, Hahn between Visitacion and Sunnydale, Sunnydale between Santos and Hahn, and Santos between Geneva and Sunnydale. Both Santos and Sunnydale Streets go through the Sunnydale Housing Projects. All of these streets have very poor pavement conditions, and inadequate protection for cyclists.

**Pedestrian Conditions**

A walk of the corridor was done on Friday afternoon, September 6, 2013, from City College to San Bruno and Silver. Pedestrian conditions on the corridor were observed as generally poor. Sidewalks on the corridor are generally narrow, ranging from 6’ to 12’ wide, degrading spontaneous activity and making it cumbersome for people in wheelchairs to maneuver. Much of the sidewalk space has obstacles. Businesses market their items on the sidewalk (Figure 9), motor vehicles are parked on the sidewalk (Figure 10), and street furniture is inadequately placed (Figure 11). All hinder pedestrian movement. But sidewalk obstruction impacts are downplayed.
Figure 11: Street furniture, especially on San Bruno Avenue, can reduce the effective sidewalk width and hinder pedestrian movement. In this image, a transit shelter occupies three-quarters of the sidewalk, creating a narrow passageway. Author photo.

in areas where pedestrian volume is low. Not only are the sidewalks in poor condition, the crosswalks often are.

Crossing conditions are also generally dissatisfactory. While some streets such as San Bruno have continental crosswalks to allow for more visible street crossings (Figure 12), and bulbouts to shorten crossing distances (Figure 13), crosswalks are often unmarked on residential streets, such as Visitacion (Figure 14). On Geneva between Brookdale and Prague, crossings do not exist for long distances, hindering the ability for those living on the south side of Geneva to access John McLaren Park. There are some crosswalks that are unsignalized, as shown in Figure 15. It is dangerous and irresponsible to allow pedestrians to cross an arterial with fast-moving traffic, effectively allowing Geneva to bisect a neighborhood. Even if there were stop signs, crossing would still be unsafe, as motorists have been known to perform ‘California stops’, in which drivers slow down without stopping, and speed through an intersection.

Parking

Parking is plentiful on the corridor. Almost every street on the corridor, except for one block, has parking. The streets providing parking have a mix of metered and unmetered spaces. Metered spaces, as observed during fieldwork observations, were in commercial areas, such as on San Bruno between Wayland and Silver, and Geneva between Mission and London. There is also a 10-space metered lot at Felton between San Bruno and Girard. Unmetered spaces also exist on the corridor. On San Bruno between Wayland and Wilde, parking is regulated through two-hour time limits. A two-hour time limit is also

Figure 12: Continental crosswalks on a recently-repaved stretch of San Bruno Ave. helps increase pedestrian visibility. Author photo.

Figure 13: Bulbout on San Bruno Avenue helps shortens crossing distances. Author photo.
Figure 14: Crosswalks like this one on Visitacion are unmarked. Author photo.

Figure 15: Unsignalized crossings, like this one at Geneva, are dangerous. Author photo.

Figure 16: Residential Parking Permit Area V, with the 8X route overlaid on the map. Source: SFMTA. Overlay by author.

Despite these available parking spaces, parking still seems to be an issue. It is not known how this is justified. Referring back to Figures 2 and 3, while there are high journey to work rates via automobile, vehicle availability is quite low compared to the rest of the city. Nearly every house in the neighborhood has a garage, which could theoretically store all these cars. Many of these garages were either converted to in-law units; it is not known how much there are because the Census ignores them, but it is estimated that about one out of three houses in the Excelsior has an in-law unit (Asian Law Caucus, 2013, 7). Despite lack of reliable mode share data to determine how many people drive to these neighborhoods to ascertain the extent of a potential parking problem, a report by the SFCTA (2003, 2) shows that about 1,560 drivers commute to Balboa Park Station park in the surrounding neighborhoods to access BART, in which 41.4% drive from south of the San Francisco-San Mateo County line, and 25.3% drive to the station from other areas of the city (SFCTA, 2003, 6).

Transit Time Reduction Proposals

The TTRP utilizes a series of items from a “toolkit” to reduce transit travel time. Toolkit items being used to specifically address bicycle, pedestrian, and parking conditions on the 8X corridor include adding transit bulbs, implementing traffic-calming devices, converting flag stops into bus zones, creating an unprecedented (in San Francisco) bike-transit lane, and optimizing, creating, removing, and consolidating stops. There are two TTRP alternatives: moderate, and expanded. Some are only included in one alternative or another, while the rest are included under both
alternatives. The expanded alternative includes most of the moderate alternative, as well as some additional modifications or different treatments from the moderate alternative.

**Bicycle Impacts**

There are plans to upgrade some Class III facilities into Class II facilities. Under the TTRP Moderate Alternative, the Class II facility gap on Geneva between Edinburgh and Vienna will be filled in. In addition, these bike lanes will be extended to Mission Street (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-178; 4.2-209; 4.2-219). Between 60’ east of Mission Street and London Streets, a transit boarding island will act as a separation buffer between traffic and the bike lane to allow for safer bicycle conditions (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-132). Right turn pockets will also be implemented at intersections to reduce right-hook collisions (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-220). Besides Geneva no plans are put forward to improve existing bicycle conditions elsewhere on the corridor in conjunction with the TEP. However, bike lanes on San Bruno between Paul and Mansell will be upgraded from Class III to Class II regardless of the final decision of TEP implementation (SFMTA, 2013c, 8-9). While these are initial steps in improving bicycling conditions and allowing diversity of mode share, it is still not optimal to foster cycling growth.

**Pedestrian Impacts**

The TTRP aims to improve pedestrian conditions through converting flag stops into bus zones, and to create transit bulbs. However, stop consolidation may negate some of these improvements.

Some flag stops on the corridor will be converted into bus zones (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-208; 4.2-219). Per the SFMTA, this will allow pedestrians to board from the curb, rather than on the street (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-74; 4.2-81; 4.2-105). This will improve pedestrian conditions since passengers may board and alight directly on the sidewalk as opposed to the street. But in some cases, pedestrians – after offboarding the bus – may still be subject to crowded sidewalks.

There is no proposal as part of the TTRP to widen sidewalks (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-208). However, there are plans to implement transit bulbouts at certain stops. Bus bulbs, where parts of a sidewalk are widened in order to provide more room for patrons to wait, will be implemented (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-129; 4.2-83; 4.2-218). Some stops will also have boarding islands. While a start, such sidewalk widening may be considered as part of the Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF and the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects. The Green Connections project may also improve pedestrian connections along the corridor, particularly in Visitacion Valley. Despite these improvements, increased walking distances caused by stop consolidation may negate these benefits.

There are no plans to remedy impacts on stop consolidation. While this may make it harder for the mobility-impaired to walk farther, the SFMTA states that stop consolidation will be a less-than-significant impact (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-81; 4.2-209; 4.2-219). That impact may be mitigated through the agency’s existing “request stop” program, where from 6:30pm to 6am, any passenger may request a bus to load at the nearside corner of any intersection of most streets in the city (SFMTA, 2013e).

**Parking**

Under the moderate alternative, 140 spaces will be selectively removed, and 50 spaces will be added (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-244; 4.2-62). 8 commercial loading zones on the corridor will also be relocated (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-226). These spaces are planned to create transit bulbouts, convert flag stops to transit zones, create new stops, or allow buses to turn adequately (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-226; 4.2-228; 4.2-247). One passenger loading zone in particular, on Geneva between Delano and San Jose, will be removed to allow for a transit-only lane (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-131; 4.2-226; 4.2-228). In addition, conversion of a flag stop into a 185’ bus zone on the south side of Geneva between Howth and Louisburg will remove five parking spaces (SFMTA, 2013d). Parking will also be removed so buses can bypass southbound left-turning traffic at Dwight/Paul and to allow buses to stop closer to the Arleta/Bayshore intersection (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-131; 4.2-2247). In addition, parking will be removed on Visitation between Hahn and Britton, Hahn between Visitation and Sunnydale, and Sunnydale between Hahn and Santos, through the Sunnydale Housing Projects, to allow buses to turn easier (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-247). Parking removal will also improve pedestrian conditions (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-62). Removal is justified because the agency does not expect parking demand to increase, given the availability of adjacent parking spaces and alternative transit modes (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-247-248).

Parking will not pose cumulative impacts for future growth (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-316; 4.2-319). It could be replenished through stop consolidation (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-89). In addition, for loading zones, such relocations might not impact traffic, transit, pedestrians, or bicyclists (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-226), and will not have a cumulative impact on loading demand (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-310; 4.2-311).

**Expanded**

The TTRP 8X Expanded Alternative is very similar to the moderate alternative with respect to parking and pedestrian conditions. There are a few minor tweaks, however. A sidewalk extension to accommodate a bus zone lengthening will create a very big bulbout, which creates more open space in the neighborhood. In addition, this plan calls for the city’s first shared bike-transit lane.

**Pedestrian Impacts**

Pedestrian improvements slated in the expanded improvements are essentially similar to the moderate alternative. Stops will still be consolidated and optimized, and bus bulbs will still be created. At San Bruno and Thornton, the sidewalk will be lengthened to partially encroach on Thornton to enlarge the bus zone (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-133). This change is demonstrated in Figures 17 and 18. Not only will this shorten crossing distances for pedestrians on that block, it also provides more room to wait for the 8X.

Several traffic calming features considered in the TTRP will be beneficial for pedestrians. Stop signs will be removed at four intersections on Visitation to make the buses faster (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-133; 4.2-218). In conjunction, pedestrian refuge islands and bulbouts will be implemented, to make crossing the street safer and shorter (SFMTA, 2013b, 2-133; 4.2-218).

**Bicycle Impacts**

Proposed bicycle improvements in the TTRP are similar to the Moderate alternative. Bike lanes on Geneva will still be extended to Mission Street from France regardless of what TTRP alternative is implemented (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-178; 4.2-209; 4.2-219) and bike lanes on San Bruno between
Paul and Mansell will still be striped (upgrading the bike facilities from Class III to Class II) regardless of whether the TEP is implemented or not (SFMTA, 2013c, 8-9). However, under the TTRP Expanded Alternative, a shared bike-transit lane (referenced in the TEP DEIR as a Class II bike lane) will be implemented in both directions on Geneva between Santos and Moscow (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-219; Figure 19). This is in response to a call in the Bike Plan that the SFMTA experiment with bicyclists on transit-only lanes, after other cities in the United States, as well as Paris, France, experienced success with these lanes (Goebel, 2010). This is a good way to mix very low volumes of modes with one another in a very constrained space. But with no separation, autos could potentially infiltrate these lanes, thereby diluting its benefits.

Even after bicycle lanes are implemented, it is possible that bicyclists will be delayed by buses loading at bulbouts. This is because buses need to block the lane to load passengers (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-209). One way to mitigate the delay is to convert the Geneva/Moscow stops into boarding islands, allowing cyclists to slip between the sidewalk and the island, as demonstrated in Figure 19.

Stop sign replacement will also have some benefits for cyclists. Albeit not a designated bike route, cycling on Visitacion will improve since the stop signs on the corridor will be removed. This provides bicyclists with a viable, fast alternative to riding on Geneva to get from Santos to Bayshore. However, this impacts bicyclists who try to cross Visitacion since they must yield to the traffic right-of-way (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-220).

Parking: 140 parking spaces will be removed under the Expanded Alternative. However, 60 spaces, 10 more over the moderate alternative, will be added, meaning a net loss of 80 spaces (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-258). As in the moderate alternative, the removal of parking spaces will occur on San Bruno Avenue, particularly between Silver and Wayland. All changes to commercial loading zones will occur on San Bruno, where five commercial loading zones at Silver, Felton, Bacon, and Dwight/Paul will be removed. Parking spaces will also be removed on the corridor comprising of Sunnydale-
Hahn-Visitacion between Santos and Britton (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-259). In other areas, up to one parking space will be removed (SFMTA, 2013, 4.2-259). This is primarily being done so to make room for bus turns, longer transit zones, and transit bulbouts (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-258). On Geneva, five spaces will be removed between Howth and Louisbourg to allow for a 185-foot bus zone (SFMTA, 2013d). A passenger loading zone at Geneva/ Delano will be replaced with a transit-only lane, just like what is detailed in the moderate alternative (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-226, 4.2-228).

Similar to the moderate alternative, there are parking spaces available on adjacent streets that will mitigate the parking removal impacts, even though demand may increase (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-258). Parking also will not pose cumulative impacts for future growth (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-316; 4.2-319). Loading spaces will be relocated within 250 feet of its original location as in they will be in the moderate alternative (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-115). Such relocations might not impact traffic, transit, pedestrians, or bicyclists (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-226) and should not have a cumulative impact on loading demand (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-310; 4.2-311).

**Timeline and Funding**

The Final EIR was released in January 2014, along with community outreach to inform changes and final design of the TTRP. The Planning Commission certified the EIR on March 27, 2014, and the SFMTA Board approved the project on March 28, 2014. Pending further outreach, the 8X TTRP will be one of two of the first TTRP corridors to be implemented in Spring 2015 (SFMTA, 2013a). This is made possible through a $11.5 million Customer First grant from the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) (Bialick, 2012; SFMTA, 2013a). There is also a $9.5 million investment from the TEP. Part of this will be funded by a $1 billion general obligation bond, as well as an increase in the Vehicle License Fee from 0.65% of a vehicle’s value to 2%; both will be on the ballot in November 2014 (City and County of San Francisco, 2013).

**Discussion**

The bicycle proposals in the TTRP are decent. On one hand, it is a welcome change since bicycle infrastructure has historically been neglected in these neighborhoods. But these lanes do not meet eight-to-eighty standards, and may not be as welcoming to novice bicyclists. As such, they are not expected to accommodate future growth expected on the corridor. Effort to diversify the mode share of the 8X corridor is very limited with little bicycle improvements on the corridor. Pedestrians, in addition, are essentially ignored. It seems that the TTRP is not addressing these issues ambitiously, despite envisioned growth that requires the City and the agency to diversify mode share before a tragedy of the commons occurs.

San Francisco is expected to see a growth of 63,800 housing units and 78,325 jobs (City and County of San Francisco, 2013, 17-18). About 4000 of those housing units and 700 of those jobs will be located along the 8X corridor. Table 1 shows the breakdown of proposed housing units along the corridor. While the 8X will be able to accommodate increased growth when the TEP is implemented, the SFCHAMP model predicts parts of the 8X corridor, particularly on San Bruno, will be at capacity in 2040 (City and County of San Francisco, 2013, 21). The Geneva-Harney BRT will attempt to remedy these problems, but the study process is just beginning, so its impact on transit in unknown. In the meantime, transit riders may shift to modes like walking or biking. There are several pitfalls. Pedestrian infrastructure will be inadequate to facilitate such a shift, especially since transit buses don’t fully widen sidewalks and only benefit transit riders. For bicyclists, prevision of buffers is not explored for the bike-transit lane, thus allowing automobiles to infiltrate this lane, endangering cyclists and diluting cycling conditions. Geneva-Harney BRT may also exclude cyclists in the future, and any light rail transit on Geneva will definitely exclude cyclists because it is dangerous for a bicyclist to have their bike caught on the tracks, and deadly if a light rail vehicle is directly behind them. Ultimately, if cycling, pedestrian, and transit fail, people may have to drive. While not everyone may drive, those who do will penalize those using alternative modes. Increased driving will facilitate increased parking demand, despite that SFMTA does not expect to see such demand (SFMTA, 2013b, 4.2-243), and variable parking fee may influence shift to other modes (SFMTA 2013b, 4.2-243). If alternative modes remain unattractive, problem with expected growth could arise. It is hoped that the City will pursue parking management like SFPark, but it is preferred that the City explore pedestrian and bicycle improvements outside of the TTRP, which they are somewhat doing.

In addition to the TTRP and Geneva-Harney BRT, other projects on the corridor seek to diversify the corridor’s mode share. The Planning Department’s Green Connections provides some hope for pedestrian and bicycling condition improvement. It attempts to create complete streets that link to open spaces in neighborhoods. Visitacion Valley is one of six neighborhoods currently being evaluated for Phase 1 of the project, with a proposed path on Hahn Street, as well as Sunnydale and Leland Avenues. Even with the TTRP improvements and Green Connections, bike-pedestrian conditions can be better improved. For starters, implement complete streets on all streets on the corridor. There must be adequate bicycle infrastructure to diversify the disproportionately-concentrated auto mode share in these neighborhoods. Wider sidewalks must be built. These changes could help diversify the area’s mode share into areas other than driving. This could also solve the sidewalk parking problem, as there will be more parking spaces available with reduced driving, so cars will not occupy the sidewalks. It is unacceptable in a Transit-First City, where a city claims to be diversifying its mode share, to allow very narrow sidewalks and inadequate bike facilities that will hinder such diversification.

Automobile mode share in the neighborhoods the 8X traverses through is particularly high. This is in spite of the transit-dependent nature of these communities, where transit is a lifeline. Not enough is being done for more improvements like sidewalk widening to happen, particularly to improve their transit experience. Of course, parking is being removed to allow for many of these changes. But even though the pedestrian realm may improve, and that there may be room for bike lanes, auto mode share may not be severely affected. To this end, the agency must consider removing more parking than already proposed. This will allow more room for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements. Any remaining parking spaces should be regulated through metering. However, I would like to suggest an exception for area residents. Because the suburban arrangement of the neighborhoods disproportionately
concentrates commercial needs along key corridors of the neighborhood, some may need a car to get around, especially if they are unable to bicycle. They should not have to pay for the metered space, but only if they are driving a car share car. Restricting free parking to car share vehicles reduces automobile mode share and ownership, while still providing residents access to an automobile when they need it. This also allows better parking management in the neighborhoods.

The population of the Southeast neighborhoods is radically changing. These neighborhoods cannot accommodate automobility any further. The agency must invest in bike-ped infrastructure to allow the residents to effectively circulate, particularly since the population in the Southeast are those who cannot afford a car.

Conclusion

The 8X TTRP proposal is not ambitious in enhancing bicyclist and pedestrian experiences. Many of the proposed changes are conceived to benefit transit and its riders, as the TTRP rightfully should be. While many proposals, like transit bulbs, flag stops, and the mixed bike/transit lane, are a welcome addition for bicyclists and pedestrians, these changes should be the bare minimum for the City. They are not designed for optimal bicyclist and pedestrian advantage, nor accommodation of the city’s future growth. Future growth is expected to burden transit, bike, and pedestrians, forcing more people to drive. Little effort is devoted to diversify the corridor’s mode share to reduce driving, despite these improvements. To facilitate diversification of mode share, wider sidewalks, Class I separated bike lanes, and more effective parking management must be provided.
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Abstract

The Los Angeles Metropolitan Area is recognized as a hyper global city for its expansive hinterland and economic ties with global capitalist systems. The population growth in the region is expected to increase substantially within the next two decades. To prepare for this growth, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) must utilize new development in Imperial County, particularly the Salton Sea region. By allocating available land in this specific portion of Los Angeles’ hinterland, development will encourage many socioeconomic and environmental benefits. The purpose of this essay is to analyze how the development of the Salton Sea could benefit the continued global influence of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area.
Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs)

In 1962, the United States Federal Government mandated Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) for any urbanized area with a population exceeding 50,000. MPOs were authorized in response to the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which President Dwight D. Eisenhower enacted into law in 1956. The Act funneled 25 billion dollars in construction for 41,000 miles of interstate highway networks in the country. The Federal-Aid Highway Act was substantially the largest public works project for the United States during this time.

Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs) are composed of various policy committees. Elected officials from local municipalities and representatives of various transportation modes (i.e. public transit, bicycles and pedestrians) are responsible for controlling the regional allocation of transportation funds from the Federal Government. Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs) take on the role of a collective regional vision, ensuring that the future costs of these funds is properly allocated through comprehensive and cooperative transportation projects and programs. Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs) are highly imperative for intergovernmental collaboration on region-wide planning processes.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments)

As of 2014, the country has about 342 MPOs. SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments) is the largest MPO in the nation. SCAG supervises about 18 million residents living within more than 180 cities. The MPO has three main committees: (1) Community Economic and Human Development, (2) Energy and Environment and (3) Transportation.

SCAG oversees six counties in the Southern region of the State of California, which are anchored by Los Angeles. These counties include Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura. The sixth county SCAG incorporates is Imperial County, although geographically, Imperial resides closer to San Diego County, which has its own MPO known as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). When looking at the coverage of SCAG, the MPO wraps around San Diego in an expansive reach to include the Imperial Valley.

Considering the terrestrial placement of Imperial County, the question arises as to why the region is incorporated with SCAG and not incorporated with SANDAG.

Imperial County accounts for only one percent of the entire population within the SCAG region. “This is a prime example of how important we are to SCAG”, stated Imperial County supervisor, Gary Wyatt (Galvan 2007). With such a small fraction of population, however, there has been much debate in recent years of whether Imperial should be assigned to another MPO due to the lack of sufficient funding from SCAG.

In 2007, Imperial County Supervisors criticized SCAG for improper allocation of funding. The California Transportation Commission cut 29.5 million dollars in funding for the Brawley Pass, a four-lane highway that was designed to ease traffic congestion and encourage faster trade movement from Mexico into Imperial County. In response to this event, Supervisor Wyatt, stated “If someone did to us what they did to us, someone would be put in prison for 10-15 years for strong-arm robbery” (Galvan 2007). The Brawley Pass project was the final affirmation of confirming that the majority of SCAG’s funding was being utilized through projects only in Los Angeles County and Orange County.

With that said, Imperial County supervisors had openly proclaimed in 2007 to cut ties with SCAG through three possible initiatives: (1) Join with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), (2) Create a new MPO with Riverside - who had also criticized SCAG’s majority of funding to be used in the Los Angeles and Orange Counties - or (3) create a new MPO for Imperial County on its own.

The second and third initiative for Imperial County to create a new MPO, either alone or along with Riverside County, was highly unreachable. The cost for a new MPO is upwards of 700,000 dollars and would take years to finalize. Furthermore, though the Coachella Valley region of Riverside County is culturally cohesive with the Imperial Valley, the vast majority of the county’s population lives in the more densely populated western portion of the county. Western Riverside County is highly associated with Los Angeles both culturally and in regards to commute patterns. In addition, if Imperial County was to join SANDAG, that would have been a greater political loss than it was experiencing with SCAG. The county would have been tangled in with 28 cities as oppose to being one out of six counties, resulting in less political representation (Galvan 2007).

Imperial County, particularly the Salton Sea region, has a large amount of land available for the allocation of future development in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area. With the anticipated population growth rates in the metropolitan area, SCAG must give Imperial County more recognition and proper sufficient funding for infrastructure projects. Since 2007, the MPO has worked on improving Imperial County’s incorporation into the association on a greater scale of acknowledgement. Such examples of greater Imperial County participation include Jon Edney, an El Centro Councilman, being granted the title of Vice President of SCAG followed with the opening of a new SCAG office branch in El Centro in 2009.

Los Angeles as a Global City

The Los Angeles Metropolitan Area is a highly recognizable hyper global city due to its economic integration in regional, national and global capitalist systems. Hyper global cities have strong imbedded relationships with their hinterlands (Olds and Yeung 2004). With Imperial County imbedded within the hinterland of Los Angeles, the development of the Salton Sea region would further facilitate the continued expanding global influence of Los Angeles. Los Angeles’s expanding economic and manufacturing influence necessitates continued population growth. By 2033, the population growth of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area is projected to add 4 million residents – 2 million more residents than the projected population growth of the Bay Area.

After years of flat numbers of population growth in California, the year 2012 marked a substantial transition. Last year, the State added 298,000 residents, representing a 2.4 percent increase (Gazaar 2013). Los Angeles embodied the largest numeric increase of growth. According to the California Department of Finance, the City of Los Angeles grew by 36,667 people last year, resulting in a one percent increase and bringing the city’s total population to an estimated 3,863,869 residents (Gazaar 2013). Out of 480 California cities, only 37
lost population growth. None of these cities were found in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area.

The population densities of Los Angeles County and Orange County contribute to the highest in the State – with about 12,000 people per square mile (Fulton 2013). Furthermore, the Inland Empire and Imperial counties are contributing to a significant rise in population density as well, with about 4,000 people per square mile.

Due to this projected population growth in Los Angeles and its surrounding hinterland, SCAG must recognize Imperial County is an excellent location to add some of this population. Therefore, the Salton Sea region, in proximity to the Imperial County, is a realistic area to provide new housing developments and other amenities for these future residents.

The Salton Sea

The history of the Salton Sea (Figure 1) is an expansive timeline of uncontrollable events. In 1905, heavy rainfall along the border of California and Arizona released rapid high spring flooding on the Colorado River. The rise in water levels crashed the canal gates leading into the Salton Trough, falling just adjacent to the developing Imperial Valley in the south. Within a duration of 18 months, engineers were finally able to control the breaching water. By complete accident, this phenomenon gave birth to what is now known today as the Salton Sea – a massive body of water that spans 45 miles in length and 20 miles in width.

The geographic site of the Salton Sea is located between the Coachella Valley and the Imperial Valley and lies directly on the San Andreas Fault. The Salton Sea is the largest lake in the State of California. The body of water occupies the lowest elevation (226 feet below sea level) in the Colorado Desert. The surface area covers 376 square miles and the maximum depth is 52 feet.

In the 1920s, the Salton Sea became a popular tourist attraction, equipped with luxurious yacht clubs, restaurants and a golf course. Housing developments were planned and built along the Salton Sea such as Bombay Beach, Desert Beach, Desert Shores, Salton City, Salton Sea Beach and North Shore. Rich upper-class families and celebrities of the time infiltrated the man-made lake as an ideal vacation spot. Soon after, promotional videos in the 1950s and 1960s declared the Salton Sea as the “French Riviera of California”, projecting images of white sanded beaches, expensive yachts sailing along the tidal waters, and young couples water skiing (Bombay Beach 2011). However despite the popularity of the beaches, the quality of the Salton Sea was unacceptable because of the salinity of the water.

By the 1970s, the salinity levels in the water began to rise dramatically. Industrial waste and toxic run-off from the nearby city of Mexicali, along with pesticides from the agricultural fields of the Imperial Valley, caused significant deaths among birds and fish that inhabited the region. The water of the Salton Sea became 50 percent saltier than the Pacific Ocean and began to swell, engulfing numerous homes and businesses that were built along the shoreline. By the 1980s, the once glamorous resort towns of the Salton Sea became ghost towns.

Today, the settlements that were originally developed around the surrounding region of the Salton Sea are desolate and isolated from inadequate resources. Population decrease coupled with severely insufficient housing has resulted in a barren wasteland that attracts mostly desert dwellers and squatters who are enticed by cheap land values.

Prior development plans before the salinity rises have been proposed to build new communities composed of numerous tract homes along the Sea. However, these attempts never gained success due to the putrid smell of the rotting fish.

Current Plans for Development of the Sea

Two years ago, one development plan near the Salton Sea was brought to light. The plan gained sufficient approval from government officials. The town, which would be called Travertine Point, is estimated to eventually grow to 40,000 people with the construction of 16,000 residential units and 5 million square feet of commercial space. The street layout in Travertine Point is greatly influenced by new urbanist ideals, and tends to encourage walkability.

The new development plan for Travertine Point could be greatly beneficial for many economic reasons. Since the 1980s, the residents along the Salton Sea have shown substantially high numbers of unemployment rates. With the addition of Travertine Point, job growth in the region is expected to rise significantly. Additionally, the developers of the planned development have emphasized incorporating numerous affordable housing complexes.

As with any process for a new development proposal, there have been problematic components for Travertine Point. Environmental activists have filed a lawsuit in state court asserting that the project will be
detrimental to the natural resources in the area. Adam Keats, a member of the Sierra Club, has stated, “It’s one of the greatest examples of dumb growth you could possible conjure up. It’s located very far away from the rest of civilization in a place that is very difficult to live” (Medina 2012).

Although the project will be 20 miles away from the nearest town, the objective of Travertine Point will hopefully provide an example of encouraging future development, as well as the proper redevelopment of settlements around the Sea. John Benoit, the Riverside County supervisor who represents the region and the approval of the project stated, “Recreational bodies of water don’t stay unoccupied forever. You can either take development piecemeal as it comes, or invest in something that is really taking the long-term view of creating comprehensive, unprecedented development” (Medina 2012).

By providing housing and resource amenities in this location, the rapidly expanding population growth of the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area will be partially sustained. Additionally, environmental activists should reconsider that new development around the Salton Sea will actually facilitate and boost the desire and necessity for environmental restoration to make the location more usable and desirable.

Economic obsolescence relates to factors outside of a property that reduce demand and negate its value (Weber). The high salinity level in the Salton Sea region is a significant example of economic obsolescence. Restoration of the Salton Sea must be accomplished in order to diminish this form of economic obsolescence and encourage economic and housing development. Therefore, environmentalists must retreat from improper allegations of resource deprecation when development will actually encourage proper restoration.

Environmental Restoration of the Salton Sea

The Salton Sea and its restoration is a very lengthy and expensive process. Draft EIRs within the past decade have looked into accomplishing the continued use of the Sea as a reservoir for irrigation drainage. Agriculture in Imperial County is the largest economic base and accumulates an estimated one billion dollars per year and supplements 1 out of 3 jobs for residents in the region. The majority of the inflow water in the Salton Sea is agricultural drain-water.

In 2003, the Imperial Irrigation District (IID), the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWA) formed the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA). Under the QSA, water that is previously used for agricultural processes that enters the Salton Sea will be redirected for urban use within the next 15 years. By the end of this 15-year period, however, the reduction of inflows into the Salton Sea will accelerate evaporation and therefore threaten fish and bird habitats, as well as causing major health concerns for residents.

The Salton Sea has no natural outlet and produces on average, 4 million tons of salt per year (U.S. Department of the Interior 2007). The rapid occurrence of high salinity in the Salton Sea is the ultimate issue of concern for encouraging development. The continually high saline levels have caused the odor of rotten fish to wane off appeal for the land.

If the Salton Sea continuously recedes in the future, there could be as much as 140 square miles of dry lakebed exposed (U.S. Department of the Interior 2007). If the restoration of the Salton Sea is left untreated, air quality concerns will become a major issue of concern for the region. Winds along the Salton Sea basin produce prevailing dust storms, and the Draft EIR for the Restoration of the Salton Sea recognizes this potential increase of the exposure of the dry lakebed to result in problematic health concerns. The Imperial Valley already has the highest childhood asthma rate in the State of California (U.S. Department of the Interior 2007). Therefore, the need for project alternatives to restore the Salton Sea in order to induce economic development is obligatory.

Project Alternatives for the Salton Sea

The total implementation costs for project alternatives to restore the Salton Sea are high. The costs vary from 3.5 billion at minimum cost and 14 billion at maximum cost. The annual reoccurring costs are estimated to be from a minimum of 119 million dollars to a maximum of 235 million dollars. There are six project alternatives proposed: (1) Mid-Sea Dam with North Marine Lake, (2) Mid-Sea Barrier with South Marine Lake, (3) Concentric Lakes, (4) North-Sea Dam with Marine Lake, (5) Habitat Enhancement without Marine Lake and (6) the No-Project alternative. The cost for the No-Project alternative is 1.4 billion dollars and the annual reoccurring costs is estimated to be 162 million dollars (U.S. Department of the Interior 2007).

The Project Alternatives for the restoration of the Sea were developed by the California Resources Agency.
The range of the alternatives are based on:

“...a set of guidelines, including, salinity control, habitat creation and restoration, differing shoreline levels, surface area configurations and different inflow conditions. The Fish and Game Code directed the alternatives to maximize the program objectives, which included maintaining salinity levels, protecting the endangered pupfish, reduce vector issues as well as compliance with other Endangered Species, environmental, water quality and air quality laws”

(Dua 2012)

Project Alternative 1 details a Saline Habitat Complex (SHC) to be formed in the southern seabed with water depths less than 6 feet. SHCs allow deep holes to be created for the protection of fish. SHCs also form pristine habitat conditions for birds in the region. In addition, a brine sink would be formed in the northern seabed. The fixed water basin would receive runoff from both the Salt and San Felipe Creeks that run through Imperial County. This would allow the salinity in the water to become sustained and neutralized.

Project Alternative 2 is similar to Alternative 1 but would contain more acreage of SHCs (21,700 acres as opposed to 16,000 acres in Alternative 1). A mid-sea barrier would be constructed to divide the Sea in two nodes. The northern node would become a brine sink, condensing the majority of the salt. The southern node would receive freshwater runoff from the Salt and San Felipe Creeks. This approach will help balance salinity levels and manage air quality.

Project Alternative 3 would form moderately deep holes in the Sea through the construction of two concentric ring-shaped lakes, controlled by surrounding barriers. This approach would help benefit marine life and air quality management by stabilizing saline levels throughout the Sea. All shorelines of the Sea would have water as well to properly conceal the dry lakebeds.

Project Alternative 4 would consist of constructing a SHC on the southern end of the sea. On the northern seabed, a marine lake for in-sea habitats would be formed, therefore creating a large brine sink in the middle of the Sea. Over time, the salinity in the middle of the sea will shrink and allow the northern and southern nodes of the Sea to become separate, restored bodies of water.

Project Alternative 5 focuses more so on shoreline habitat. Five separate SHCs would be constructed (a total surface area of 42,200 acres). About 20 percent of the SHCs would be for deep water holes to sustain fish populations. The other 80 percent would be pertained towards sustaining shoreline revitalization (concealing dry lakebeds and sustaining bird habitats).

The No-Project Alternative, which is required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is used as a comparison with the other alternatives to represent what would happen if no action was taken. If no action were taken towards restoration, the future of the Sea will dramatically change. By 2040, the Sea is expected to shrink by 60 percent.

The Aral Sea was formerly one of the four largest lakes in the world, with an area spanning 26,300 square miles. The Aral Sea lies between Kazakhstan in the north and Uzbekistan in the south. In the 1960s, the Aral Sea began to shrink due to the divergence of river inflows from Soviet irrigation projects. By 2007, the Aral Sea had waned by 10 percent of its original size due to high saline levels.

Before the 1960s, the regions around the Aral Sea heavily relied on fishing to support their economic stability. The fishing industry that was operated in the region had employed up to 40,000 people and produced one-sixth of the Soviet Union’s fish catch.

Due to the high saline levels, the fish that once occupied the Aral Sea have consistently died off, resulting in high levels of unemployment rates.

In addition, toxic chemicals and pesticides have heavily polluted the region. Strong winds have picked up toxins from the dry lakebeds. Public health concerns for the inhabitants around the Aral Sea have obtained serious illnesses such as tuberculosis and cancer.

When observing this pattern of large bodies of water being decremented in size by pollution, high saline levels and improper inflows of river channels, the economic and health outcomes are dramatically destructive. Though it is on a much larger scale, the fate of the Aral Sea and its effects on the health and economy of surrounding regions are relevant to the discussion of Salton Sea restoration and development. For both the Salton and Aral Seas, environmental restoration is needed to produce revitalization of economic abundance and proper health stabilization.

The Relationship between the County of Los Angeles and Water

The history of Los Angeles and water represents an urban regime’s expansion of securing resources from extended distances. In 1908, the Los Angeles Aqueduct began construction under the supervision of Chief Engineer William Mulholland. The aqueduct delivers water from Owens River in the Eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains to Los Angeles. The system consists of 223 miles of steel pipe, 120 miles of railroad track, 170 miles of power line and 500 miles of road. This vast expansion of water allocation is remarkably influential to the built environment of Los Angeles. However, the project ultimately eliminated the Owens Valley, which was a feasible farming community prior to the construction of the aqueduct. The Owens River ecosystem was eventually destroyed by the construction as well.

In 1986, American environmentalist and writer Marc Reisner published Cadillac Desert, which details water policy concepts and land development initiatives in the Western United States. Reisner argues that prior development policies formed during the settling of the Western United States are now having longstanding negative effects on the quality of water and the environment.

In regards to Los Angeles, Reisner states that the creation of Los Angeles was the result of the availability of water resources. And that water alone, had made the city become as geographically large as it is today.
The Owens River created Los Angeles, letting a great city grow where common sense dictated that one should never be, but one could just as well say that is ruined Los Angeles, too. The annexation of the San Fernando Valley, a direct result of the aqueduct, instantly made it the largest city in geographic size. The Owens River made Los Angeles large and wealthy enough to go out and capture any river within 600 hundred miles, and that made it larger, wealthier and a good deal more awful” (Reisner, 1986).

Reisner’s argument is that the “suburban quality of Los Angeles is the direct result of a lust for water in a near-desert region, the natural architectural outcome for a city that stretched itself unnaturally [and immorally] to quench its growing thirst” (Hawthorne 2011). Reisner’s notion of Los Angeles as a suburban metropolis is supported by the irrigation of numerous golf courses, lawns and long landscaped boulevards that are lined with parking lots. Similarly, the allocation of the Salton Sea to expand the global influence of Los Angeles is similar to Reisner’s argument through the component of accelerated urban expansion derived from water resource allocation. However, the means for using the Sea’s water is undoubtedly unusable for irrigating Los Angeles to continue its growth. Rather the push to develop and urbanize the Sea is a modern example of Angelino’s continued desire to live by water. But instead of environmental degradation, the extension of Los Angeles’ global influence to the Salton Sea will actually help encourage environmental restoration of a barren wasteland. Unlike the obtainment of Owens River for the construction of the Los Angeles Aqueduct, settlements along the Salton Sea will not end up like those in the detrimental outcome of Owens Valley. Instead, the settlements existing in the region now (Bombay Beach, Salton City, Desert Shores, etc.) will benefit in future economic and environmental acquisition.

Conclusion

To conclude, the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area, represented politically by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), is a significant hyper global city in the urban hierarchy of global control centers. As sprawl continues its march east through the almost built-out Inland Empire, it is certain that a significant portion of the region’s growth will occur in the Imperial County. Redevelopment and investment around the Salton Sea will help to encourage socioeconomic growth and reduce environmental degradation in the far reaches of the Southern California Megalopolis. These two components will benefit and further encourage future population growth around the sea.

From the research collected, it is obvious that the maintenance and revitalization of the Salton Sea’s development is a lengthy and expensive process and its ability to impact the current global influence of Los Angeles may take decades to accomplish. However, the attempted recognition of the region’s high potential for investment is a plausible approach to concur credible land allocation for the extension of Los Angeles’ global influence.
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Contours of the City

Week 1

Week 2
it is by riding a bicycle that you learn the contours of a country best, since you have to sweat up the hills and coast down them

Ernest Hemingway

These are gps representations of my weekly bicycle rides through the sunset district and the surrounding areas

by brenten lovato
New Urban Policing

Abstract

This paper explores the links between militarism and urbanism, and how advancements in technologies are becoming the new machines of war. Policing is being developed to sort through the ever growing global population in order to stop threats before they can be realized. Urban spaces, especially within developed countries allow for the development, and testing of new policing practices and techniques that will eventually dramatically influence all members of the global urban population in everyday life. The discussion of rights and policies in relationship to the monitored, within the “New Policing” environment, ultimately will be decided by our governments and militaries, and not the general population.

Historically, colonial powers experimented with new techniques and technological advances to conquer and suppress populations. Panoptic prisons were designed in the late 1700’s to utilize a minimal management technique by installing watchmen in a tower located at the center of a circular shaped building “... to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action...” (Foucault 1975). Those who are inside the prisons can not determine if they are being watched, or not, which in turn instills a constant feeling of paranoia and domination.

Such advancements as the boulevards in Paris designed by Baron Haussmann for Napoleon III in the mid 1800’s were designed not only for beauty, but also, “Conveniently leading out from barracks...” (Herbet 1988), to quell potential uprisings by citizens, and foreign invasions alike by providing a clear field of vision for the military to negotiate threats, and maneuver weapons against enemies. The techniques were brought back to the new worlds, and deployed with greater precision towards domestic populations.

This trend still continues today with technologies being developed, and explored through new age battlefields in the Middle East, South Asia, and domestically. “Industrialization and urbanization produced... new challenges for social control. They also provided opportunities for social control at a level previously unknown” (Williams 2003). New battlefields and testing grounds allow for exploration and experimentation of modern policing techniques which will inevitably be exported for deployment in use towards urban populations. Global population is urbanizing at a never before seen rate into already populated areas, new forms of policing will be tailored to best suite the environment of focus, and such particular “theatres” deemed to be a threat. Whether that may be...
a purposely destabilized barren desert landscape or a densely populated urban environment, new urban policing measures will continue to be engineered years in advance. Irregular types of policing and warfare take place domestically, and across borders in an uneasingly urbanizing world. Because these battle spaces are becoming more and more urban oriented, the planning of our environment will be ever more important to consider. Increasingly, "...contemporary warfare takes place in supermarkets, tower blocks, subway tunnels, and industrial districts rather than open fields, jungles, or deserts" (Graham 2002). Asymmetric, non conventional warfare is being developed with increasingly individualistic uniqueness to cater to the needs being dictated by the changing contemporary urban environment, as well as perceived threats from theatres not yet recognized. As the trends in robotics and policing are explored below, the highly profitable black economy of the war machine makes an appearance. New urban policing is a consequence of high level governmental racketeering to allocate funds into defense contracts in the fields of robotics, surveillance, and other fields that are now profitable in the new age of urban policing. One example is Israel's expertise in control of population movements through the construction of the Israeli-Gaza barrier wall. This lethal high-tech wall is constructed at parts by armed check-points, razor wire, electrified fencing, panoptically influenced concrete towers and walls, motion sensors, radiological sensors, and x-ray scanners that are designed to enforce a buffer zone between Israel, from the Gaza Strip and Egypt. Not only does this wall provide a physical barrier to movement, its menacing size and cloaked technological capabilities encourages second thoughts to would be threats, and wages a 24/7 war on the minds of it's enemies. Movement of humans, communications, commerce, electricity, food, and water is almost completely controlled by Israel to the Gaza Strip. In a moments notice, the prison land beyond the wall can be prepared for a military operation with minimal effort.

The United Kingdom's upper hand and expertise with border monitoring is evident through the use of the U.K.'s E-borders program. It was developed in part by the Raytheon Company, to secure the United Kingdom from threats by 2014, by identifying, and tracking visitors movements entering and leaving the country. This monitoring will be conducted by "...continually comparing current behaviour with vast databases by recording past events and associations" (Graham 2009). Without a doubt, at some point, our current behaviour will be compared against past actions to identify the possibility of potential "non-cooperative" behaviour. "Anticipatory targeting" is being utilized not only for surveillance functions, but also for intelligence within these new machines. Raytheon is further rendering results to create machines such as cruise missiles, and drone airplanes that display autonomous thought, to administer justice without the presence of consciousness, or compassion. The future of war is said to be "...their sons against our silicon...where such swarms of robotic warriors work to continually 'project destructive power precisely, judiciously, and from a safe distance...'" (Huber, Mills 2002). Forced into a new war by way of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks; domestically, the United States of America is able to present the concept of terrorism as a undefinable, malicious and persistent enemy. An enemy that is so elusive and capable of great destruction if not prevented, monitored and eliminated, failing to defend against such threats would result indescribable loss. Under this new war rhetoric, newly emerging industries are able to capitalize on the inevitable and unfortunate events generated by war through large scale funding, and contributions. The threat of perpetual war allows the United States to develop technologies through the “resurgence of explicitly colonial strategies and techniques...” "...in the contemporary period..." that "...involves not just the deployment of the techniques of the new military urbanism in foreign war zones but their diffusion and imitation through the securitization of Western urban life" (Foucault 2003). A population that is perpetually bombarded with potential threats is receptive to countermeasure that provide advantages, however, the rate at which technological solutions are being developed allows for an ever widening gap in understanding the consequences that affect the urban environment. Because this warfare is so unique, the battlespace is endless and the war is continual, thus encompassing every aspect of our lives from the molecular level to the virtual realm. Furthermore, the variety of threats that are generated from the endless possibilities of “our enemies” require nations to re-examine their citizens rights in the name of security and future prosperity.

The urban environment is a seemingly endless arena for surveillance and violence to operate within. Specific technologies can exploit particulars of the built environment, thus allowing for the development and deployment of new technologies and tactics. Irregular or amateurish types of war are often referred to as "Open-..."
Source" warfare, where missions can be executed from a hobby-grade radio controlled machine, or engineered from a coffee shop or dorm room. Regardless of the sophistication involved, new measures and techniques to insure accessibility to the contemporary theatre will be developed to counter regimes and amateurs alike.

**UAVs**

Gatekeeping Monitoring borders is just the beginning to understanding how access is being controlled within the built environment. In 1995, General Atomics introduced the now notorious MQ-1 Predator UAV (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle). Currently, this manless aircraft it is being used globally for both combat and surveillance missions. “Predators are flown by what are called “reachback” or “remote-split” operations. While the drone flies out of bases in the warzone, the pilot and sensor operator for the plane are physically located seventy-five hundred miles away, connected with the drone plane only via satellite communications” (Singer 2009).

As it appears, a totally automated world in which we are surrounded and monitored by artificial intelligence is somewhere in the near future, but humans have already lost battles to robots historically. The first human surrender to a robot was when the U.S. Navy used a UAV to pinpoint targets for its 16” guns firing from its World War II style battleships. During the described mission, a Pioneer UAV flew over a group of Iraqi soldiers who instead of waiting to be nailed by a 2,000-pound shell waved sheets of surrender, and undershirts at the drone. This was the first time in history that human soldiers from any military surrendered to a UAV system.

Lockheed Martin is another fine purveyor of UAVs, such as the RQ-170 Sentinel stealth drone with an estimated sixty-six foot wingspan made public when it was embarrassingly forced down by Iranian military hackers. But not all of Lockheed Martin’s UAVs are large and stealthy, nor do they need to be. Recently developed is the now publicly known maple seed-like “Samurai” drone. This vehicle spins using lift from a wing, similar to that of a maple tree seed falling in a vortex from a tree. This tiny drone is also used for surveillance, measuring approximately twelve inches in length. Frightenly, one could imagine hundreds if not thousands of these tiny drones constantly in flight, monitoring every move of a population simultaneously guided by pre-programmed flight patterns.

**Tracked Vehicles**

However, not all drone activity is restricted to the air. Companies like iRobot and Foster-Miller are responsible for terrestrial operating robots such as the Packbot, and the Talon respectively. These drone robots are able to operate on almost any terrain from underwater, to mud and ice. Variations on these machines can range from optical attachments for surveillance, to control arms and grappling with variations capable of being outfitted with rocket launchers and machine guns. The pinnacle of these terrestrial drones would have to be the SWORDS (Special Weapons Observation Reconnaissance Detection System) version of the Talon robot which allows this machine to dominate a battle field confirming, and neutralizing targets if shot at.

**The Walking**

However remarkable: drone aircraft, wheeled, tracked or stationary machines may be, the future in drone technologies is focusing towards a humanoid like representation. “Moreover, almost all the adjustments we have made to...” Earths “…surface to make it of value to us, our cities, and buildings, were designed for those with legs” (Singer, 2009). Unnerving to consider further, are robots resembling humans operating within the urban environment. Amongst us, possibly unrecognizable, they will monitor our behaviours, and react accordingly if designed to reign authority similar to that of James Cameron’s 1984 movie, The Terminator. Such notable teams developing human-like representations are Honda’s Asimo, HPR-4 designed by the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology in Japan, and NAO developed by Aldebaran Robotics in France. Each robots particular characteristics differ in replication, however, the most notable robot is Asimo. Since the 1980’s, Honda has began exploring the psychological connection humans have with artificial intelligence. Asimo displays incredible life like characteristics at just 4 feet in height, and is able to multi task commands with ease. It was designed to be a “helper type” robot to assist with light tasks such as serving and greeting, as well as accepting and directing commands. Clearly, Honda appears to be leading the way in a very eerie human-like replica that is indeed likable. Big Dog is another representation engineered by Boston Dynamics; a legged robot designed to carry gear and supplies as well as assist in combat operations. It can also function in a security mode, or as a charging station for electronics and other gear. It has four legs and resembles a mule or another type of donkey-like animal.

**USVs**

Boat drones, or USV (Unmanned Surface Vessel) are also being developed such as the Protector, from Israel’s Rafael Armament Development
police, fire and similar departments will be able to fly drones weighing as much as 25 pounds (11.3 kilos) without applying for special approvals needed under previous regulations” (Bloomberg 2012).

As drone innovations continue to emerge, it will be interesting to consider how building practices might change to give preferential treatment to drone access.

Of the first departments to pursue such allowances, the Little Rock, Arkansas Police Department now flies a UAV named the Rotomotion SR30. It is a helicopter that carries a zoom camera as well as other infrared technologies. According to the Little Rock Police Department, “The system is designed to track objects,” and can operate on a pre-programmable mission directive. Due to the fact that this is only the beginning in revolutionizing local safety and service capabilities, the Little Rock Police Department is allowed under the FAA to operate the drone at heights up to 400’ until the end of 2012. Though this drone helicopter has a remote command base station and First Person Viewing perspective, the machine is in fact a glorified toy powered by a gasoline engine.

Drones as a Novelty
Such machines can be controlled by using a smartphone or tablet as the controller. Instead of the unit depending upon a satellite transmission for instruction, these toys are being controlled by wifi signals. Video images are transmitted back to the smartphone user, and its commands are in turn transmitted back to the toy via a self generated wifi signal. Quadrocopters and other helicopter style machines are now being marketed as toys for novelty purposes, and available from such popular publications as Skymall and The Sharper Image.

Even more elaborate and sophisticated, are the machines that are available through the hobby trade. Chris Anderson of Wired Magazine has developed a DIY-Drones business inspired by military technology gathered by Wired. The company publishes on construction techniques and schematics relating to drone development. The purpose of this site is to enable the engineer of the machine to build for a fraction of the price, and even control them from several miles away using amplified radio signals and modified antennas. This new trend in the model rc hobby trade is called FPV or First Person View RC. The user of the device puts on goggles that display a image onto the screen live from the radio controlled machine. This technology is clearly no longer restricted to powerful government regimes. Rather it has evolved into a vast assortment of potential weapon delivery platforms available to the hobbyist, or adversary with a modest budget and internet connection. Unmanned vehicles can now be built, and operated by the hobbyist, and deployed against an empowered regime, or unsuspecting population. Property is more easily protected, while privacy will continue to diminish.

Ethical Consideration
People in certain parts of the world can hear drones everyday, and everynight as they are in the ever looming possibility of death from the heavens above. Almost unimaginable to think of this scenario here at home, it is far from the case in other regions. The United States Government’s use of drones in the Middle East and in South Asia as a somewhat precise and deadly tool, makes this nations interests more secure some would argue, by surgically eliminating threats. However, this is by no means the truth or remotely accurate. A report Living with drones, was done by both Stanford University, and New York University Law School. Jennifer Gibson, author, and attorney with Reprieve; a United Kingdom legal charity that represents, and attempts to preserve human rights for a growing client list of Pakistani victims attacked by the use of drone warfare. The survivors of the drone strikes she says: "...live under the constant threat of annihilation... and are [the drones] a "...constant presence" in the airspace near Northern Waziristan tribal areas in Pakistan. She reports as "...many as six hovering over villages at any one time," and states: “People hear them day and night.”

The implication to society is great she describes, “Parents are afraid to take their children to school, women are afraid to meet in markets, families are afraid to gather at funerals and drivers are afraid to deliver food from other parts of the country... The routines of daily life have been ripped to shreds.” She goes on to argue that, “[The presence of drones] has turned North Waziristan into the world’s largest prison", by consistently bases operating aircraft in a particular zone. Gibson suggests that a type of paranoia develops and exists in the area of operation. The flying machines paralyze the society below and make population extremely unproductive and nervous to operate normal routines and schedules associated with regular life. Not only do they reap psychological and physical harm, the drones have unrealized consequences such as violations of the “laws of warfare,” assassination laws, and human rights violations.

Increasingly, more advancements in urban policing will become the integrated norm in everyday policing techniques. Everything we have designed to benefit ourselves previously will be re-programed with intelligence as the foundation instead of practicality. We will certainly in
the future argue; ‘that because we can, does not mean as a society we must impregnate a brain and a form of microprocessing intelligence into every one of our creations. Designing urban environments to be policeable in the future will be a strategic necessity in order to cater to the developing insatiable trend towards robotics and broad based engineering fields. However, the global urban environment is still being built, so designing the manless police force of the future will be profitable for years to come. From understanding the monetary implications to addressing the ethical issues generated by the use of drones, new variables will need to be examined. Producing a continuously monitored society not only creates a viewable society, but one that is imprisoned by way of its historical empirical ways. Though used as a toy in particular applications, the modern robot can assist global regimes in complete domination, and assist in the toppling of others. Monitoring a population constantly as many governments have begun to do inspires and motivates the technologically gifted to rebel and resist such infringements on personal liberties. Ironically, one can predict that as the technologies mature the countermeasures of resistance will continue to evolve as well. Society as a whole must respect the great leaps and bounds brought forth by the development of drone technologies for it will not be long until our enemies replace their IEDs controlled by cell phones, and wage their drones against ours in a new type of autonomous robotic war of horror.
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Entrada Court, a quiet cul-de-sac sitting at the center of Ingleside Terrace, is an unexplored heritage of San Francisco. Featured by a century-year-old sundial community park, where the city's largest sundial is found, this space deserves better design to unfold the intriguing local history, while enhancing community participation. Aspiring to bring spontaneity and energy into the neighborhood, a site analysis of Entrada Court is performed to envision design possibilities that seek a delicate balance between social fabric and lived space.
A City for Single Mothers

Colton L. Coty

Abstract

Urban planning throughout its history has been adherent to the societal structure of patriarchy. Planners historically have been men, planning cities for men, while often excluding necessary urban provisions for women rearing their children. This was due to the well-practiced belief that women’s primary duty was remaining at home raising children whereas men, the “providers,” would work in the economic realm and earn the necessary finances for their families. As a result, the planned landscape of a city facilitates men to predominantly regulate government, manage business, and partake in the social realm cities had to offer. Consequently, women and children were generally ignored.

Today this notion is not the preeminent concept. Women’s duties in society have significantly changed since the early 1900s, and females have much more independence than they did previously. Women are now CEOs, business owners, government officials, and are becoming more integral in urban economies. The problem is, however, that as this trend transforms gender roles from patriarchy toward matriarchy, single mothers (specifically) are still afflicted because they lack the financial support of another working spouse. Subsequently, single mothers have a difficult time competing in the professional economic realm because childcare is already their full-time job.

This paper aims to provide sustainable policy and planning solutions for single mothers so their children receive adequate childcare while simultaneously allowing the mother’s progression in the economic realm. These solutions will focus on sustainable transportation, housing, and urban design.
Demographics of the Single Mother

A statistical analysis correlating poverty and female-headed households must be established prior to a discussion on policy and planning solutions for single mothers. This analysis will provide empirical evidence as to why single mothers are considered one of the most afflicted demographic categories. Data for this analysis derives from the U.S Census Bureau (1998, 2000, & 2005 data) and the National Center of Health Statistics. Tables and variables to be observed are:

Table 1: Poverty Rates by Family Size. Variables include: poverty rate percentage, female-headed families, two-parent families, and number of children (U.S. Census Bureau 2005).

Table 2: Percent of Births to Unmarried Mothers by Race (1960 - 2003). Variables include: Percent of all births, unmarried mothers (white and black) (National Center for Health Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau).

Table 3: Poverty by Family Structure and Race. Variables include: family type and race, number in poverty (in thousands), and the poverty rate (U.S. Census Bureau 2005).

In chapter eight of Bradley R. Schiller’s The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination, he uses the above figures to describe poverty based off family size and structure. These will be discussed later in greater detail, but first one must understand certain policies and circumstances outlined by Schiller to add depth for these tables. According to Schiller, “Children are a distinct threat to the financial security of a family. Additional children not only increase the need for more income but also limit the ability of parents to earn it.”

Schiller is quite straightforward with this statement, however its message is strictly factual. Children require massive amounts of financial, temporal, and emotional resources, which according to American standards, should be provided by a father and mother. The more children, the more resources parents must provide for them. However the troubling fact is that a single parent, or female in particular, must provide all those resources singlehandedly whether it comes from government subsidies or from the job they maintain.

Being a parent is arguably a full time job, which prevents many single mothers from making it to work. Children will get sick, they have to attend school, they must be fed, have clothes, remain clean, and so on. The amount of time needed to complete these necessary tasks are extremely time consuming, and thus the ability for a single mother to maintain a job long-term is rare. Many single mothers have to rely on financial resources supplemented outside of their income because they have a hard time providing a steady income to pay for the life of their child. As a result, many single mothers live in poverty.
But how do we define poverty? What are the numbers associated with a single mother living in poverty? According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the poverty line considers any single household making $11,490 or below a year impoverished. A household of two is $15,510 a year or below, a household of three is $19,530 a year or below, and a household of four is $23,550 a year or below. The poverty rate is the percentage of a particular demographic that falls below the poverty line threshold.

The pre-determined Federal Scale of poverty allows the analysis of poverty rates through family size previously presented in Table 1. Table 1 shows poverty rates by family size in 2005. The percentage of two-parent families living within the federal poverty threshold ($0 - $15,510) with one child was about 5% (internal citation). Impoverished households with two parents and two children ($0 - $23,550) were about 7% (internal citation). Moving along the x-axis, there is an increase of two parent families within the Federally designated poverty threshold when the amount of children increases to four (internal citation).

In turn, 30% of female-headed households with one child lived within the poverty threshold ($0 - $15,510), 35% with two children lived within their poverty threshold ($0 - $19,530), and 60% with three children lived within their poverty threshold ($0 - $23,550). Correspondingly, 80% of single mothers with five children lived within their designated poverty threshold (internal citation).

The margin between single female-headed households and two parent households living within their poverty thresholds is quite extreme. In 2005 families with two parents and a single child comprised 5% of households living within the federally determined confines of poverty (internal citation). However, the removal of the male parent from the nuclear family makeup increases this percentage to 25% (internal citation). The percentage of impoverished families continues to increase with the progression down the x-axis. This was shown through an increased number of children and a simultaneous removal of the male parent.

Table 1 shows how single mothers are afflicted more so than two parent families. However when you breakdown single mothers into designated racial categories there is even more distasteful data.

Data collected from the National Center for Health Statistics and the U.S. Census Bureau (1960 - 2003) in Table 2 displays the percent of all births amongst white and black unmarried mothers. In 1960, 2.3% of white births were born to unmarried white mothers, whereas 21.6% of black births were born to unmarried black mothers (internal citation). In the year 1980, both black and white unmarried mothers significantly increased the amount of births for their race. Children of white unmarried mothers accounted for 11%, whereas children of black unmarried mothers accounted for 55.3% of the total population of children born (internal citation). As of the year 2000, children of white unmarried mothers accounted for 27.1% of children born (internal citation). Contrastingly, the children of black unmarried mothers were responsible for 68.5% of children born (internal citation).

From this data we can conclude a diverse array of information regarding single mothers and their racial groups. First, unmarried black single mothers make up a larger percentage of all births for their race compared to unmarried white women: a 19.3% difference in 1960, 44.3% difference in 1980, and a 41.4% difference in 2000. Thus black single mothers empirically have had a larger amount of of children than white single mothers. Correspondingly, since female-headed families have had higher rates of poverty, it is credible to suggest that black single mothers are the demographic group most affected by poverty.

An assessment of the previous data finds that it does not include Hispanic unmarried mothers. In addition, most of the previous data has also excluded single male-headed families. Table 3 will provide some insight for these demographic groups in the year 2005.

Table 3 shows that for Hispanic families, 17.9% of two parent families lived within their poverty thresholds, 44% of mother only households lived in poverty, and 20.3% of father only families lived in poverty (internal citation). For black father only families, 29.3% lived in poverty compared to 45.3% of black mother only families who lived in poverty (internal citation). Lastly 18.8% of father only white families lived in poverty whereas 29.8% of mother only families lived in poverty (internal citation).

Statistically, single mothers of all races live in poverty more so than single fathers. However, when you breakdown the data into racial groups, you see that black single mothers live in poverty more than any other racial group. Hispanic single mothers are second worst, whereas white single mothers are the least. After analyzing the data, the question of why single fathers are better off than women statistically arose. They have the same childcare responsibilities that theoretically should take up just as much time as women have.

Patriarchy has been enforced through continuous societal predispositions about career paths and income levels. Since men have historically been the so-called “bread winners,” they have the high-income jobs that allow them to provide childcare through outside services. Women, in turn, historically have been at home and thus not developing the human capital to achieve these high-end professional jobs. As a result, single mothers have higher poverty rates because they have decades of inhibited professional development from societal gender roles and norms. However, times are changing.

Women today are becoming more embedded in the professional world. However according to the data analyzed earlier, once the male leaves the picture after childbirth there is a higher chance the child will not succeed and thus live in poverty. The solution for preventing this scenario from happening is found in the art of city planning and public policy. Although, there must be a change of direction from where current city planners tend to focus: commute to work by automobile, office and retail development downtown, and designing public transit to accommodate mass hordes of people.
All of these practices favor the male dominated professional world, and ignore accommodation for families.

The data listed above proves this theory because once the bread winning male professional is removed from the picture, poverty rates for women increase significantly. Thus city planners and policy makers must take into account that the planning of cities for families, rather than business men, will help alleviate poverty rates and make the urban environment accessible to all.

To begin, the first recommendation will focus on creating sustainable transportation features that accommodate families in particular. Such recommendations correlate to bicycle and public transportation improvements that accommodate women and children. Secondly, housing developments can be created to provide amenities that will benefit single mothers who are trying to remain in the workforce full-time. The third solution will show design features of urban public space that make transporting a child much easier and effective. The last solution will focus on safety, and how to make urban streets feel safer for single women and their children.

**Sustainable Transportation**

Sustainable transportation engineering and planning tends to simultaneously focus on preserving the environment, promoting economic development around public transportation, and maintaining a sociable community through public interaction. Albeit these three forces of sustainability are now widely recognized, there are other beneficial provisions within these forces that remain unacknowledged: The benefits they have toward families, and single mothers in particular. Such examples will focus on public transportation, as well as bicycle design and infrastructure.

Many cities already succeed in these solutions (which will be presented later) and are not being chastised for their current transit and bicycle policy or infrastructure. For example, San Francisco, New York, Paris, London, Zurich, and Amsterdam all have major innovations in sustainable transportation. What they do not succeed in, however, is the accommodation for families. Their transit systems are meant to hold massive amounts of people like sardines during peak rush hours, specifically catering to businessmen. The issue with this type of accommodation is that those who have tighter time constraints and complex travel patterns (parents) (Gossen and Purvis, 2005) find these peak hours impossible to travel with a stroller or their children when the train or bus lacks specific accommodation features.

For example, trains and buses that require steps to get on and off can significantly trouble parents trying to get their children on and off trains, including the other items they may be carrying (stroller, groceries, etc.). In addition, current policy requires that seats be reserved for the elderly and disabled, however parents also need a type of priority seating. This is increasingly relevant for single mothers who ride transit with multiple children.

A solution derived from Jeffrey Tumlin’s Sustainable Transportation Planning, recommends policy and planning recommendations that will mitigate these issues. For example, low floor level boarding is a design recommendation for transit vehicles in which the base of the vehicle where people stand is closer to the floor. Additionally, there are no steps in this design. With the removal of steps and low level floors, parents could easily get on and off the vehicle.

All door boarding is another recommendation Tumlin makes which allows passengers to enter the vehicle through any door, rather than just the front. This would allow parents to enter through any door rather than being forced to the front, which could have fewer seats available. However since this “open door” policy does not necessarily force people to pay up front, there needs to be coordination with other payment policies to efficiently work with all door boarding. Thus operation cost savings from reduced payment times at the front of the vehicle exceed lost fare revenue.

In regard to available seating within the vehicle, however, a parent with their children should be able to get priority seating. This allows for the parent to easily hold their child and not worry about standing on a train or bus that tends to stop suddenly and accelerate quickly. However, priority seats would be shared with those for the elderly and people with disabilities, which may lead to some supply shortages. As a solution to this, transit policy makers should make all seats priority for the elderly, disabled, and parents. This would increase supply for all those who need seating.

Stroller access on a transit vehicle is another issue that must be addressed. Requiring a stroller to be folded before entering the vehicle puts extra work upon the parent and requires them to carry two things: Stroller and the baby separately. This problem makes parents carry more on the train, and makes it more difficult to hold onto a pole when needed to stand. Thus, strollers should be allowed to lift the wheelchair accessible seats near vehicle doors to place their strollers out of the way, without having to fold them up. Although, priority of this space would still be given to someone with a wheelchair. A policy allowing parents to occupy this space with their baby in the stroller makes it much easier for them to board and exit the vehicle reducing operating costs that accrue when the train has to wait for the parent.

These policy recommendations make transit more efficient, accessible, and economically feasible. Transit will be quicker due to reduced boarding times from wheelchairs, strollers, and front door only boarding, which will hopefully promote more people to take public transit. Additionally, allowing priority seating for parents, elderly and the disabled, along with letting strollers use wheelchair areas, will benefit those who need them most.

Although promoting more people to use public transit as an integral step in sustainability, one also needs to recognize the utilization of cycling rather than vehicles. However, the bicycle can initially seem daunting to parents that have tighter time constraints and more complex travel patterns. According to City Cycling: Women and Cycling by Jan Garrard, Susan Handy, and Jennifer Dill, this should not be the case. According to their research, replacing car trips with bicycle trips...
provides many benefits for health, transportation, livability, and the environment. Bicycling is also much quicker and more cost effective than driving an automobile. This is especially significant for women, because according to Bas de Geus, J. Joncheree, and Romain Meeusen from the Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, cycling has been shown to significantly improve performance. Additionally, cycling can reduce the risk of all-cause mortality in women (Matthews, et al. 2007). Since single mothers typically lack the time to exercise, incorporating cycling into their daily routine will provide them with the adequate exercise to remain healthy individuals.

In addition to improved health, cycling in combination with bicycle accessible public transportation will help with the short, complex travel patterns that parents have. If public transit stations had enough bike parking, security, and on-board bike storage, parents would be able to bike their children for half or the full length of their trip. Unfortunately there are many safety concerns with bicycling that generally prevent parents from biking their kids or allowing their kids to bike. Transportation planners should address this by funding wider and better-protected bike infrastructure to help mitigate this fear. Additionally, wider bike lanes will allow for parents to ride next to their children rather than in front of, or behind.

With all of these policy and planning recommendations there will be better accessibility for families on public transit, and safer streets for parents and children cycling. Transportation costs will remain low, children will become more independent, and single mothers will feel more comfortable going to work, and utilizing public transportation to get basic goods and services.

Housing and Urban Design
Now that sustainable transportation provisions for single mothers have been distinguished, it is now time to shift toward its integration with housing policy and planning. The previous sustainable transportation recommendations will not work unless they center on dense, mixed-use, housing developments that will provide the adequate amount of ridership. However, there are additional provisions that could be included in these housing developments that make raising a child easy, reliable, and walkable.

In current urban neighborhoods, children seem to be condemned to play on the streets. Jane Jacobs in The Death and Life of Great American Cities, touches on this and provides some insight as to why urban neighborhoods need housing developments built for families. “If only these deprived children can be gotten off the streets into parks and playgrounds with equipment on which to exercise, space in which to run, grass to lift their souls! Clean and happy places, filled with the laughter of children responding to a wholesome environment. So much for the fantasy” (page number). Indeed a fantasy, Ms. Jacobs. This is typically the harsh reality for children growing up in dense areas with little open space.

Thus as a solution, new housing developments should mimic something similar to a “Garden City” which taller buildings are encompassed by large quantities of land. Although the Garden City has its flaws (which Jacobs heavily criticized in her text), equilibrium could be established in dense, mixed-use housing developments and enough open space for children.

This image depicts a great example of this design: A view into one of the courtyards at Women-Work-City. (Image courtesy archive Franziska Ullmann)

In an article written by Clare Foran for The Atlantic Cities called How to Design a City for Women, she writes about Vienna, Austria and their trends in building housing developments for mothers, such as the one depicted above. Within these housing developments, they provide amenities such as day care, physician offices, pharmacies, and playgrounds. Due to the fact that these amenities are conveniently placed on site, women do not have to travel far to get the basic childcare services the need. Thus, they can keep their children supervised near their home as they participate in the workforce.

The image on the top of the following page is of an on-site kindergarten. Women-Work-City has an on-site kindergarten. (Image credit: Paolo Mazzoleni)

Another amenity that housing developments and public spaces should have is a set of stairs that effectively accommodate strollers and wheelchair users. Although policies require there be accessible ramps, many of them are poorly
designed and make going up a few steps seem like a trip around a building.

On the top right of the next page is a picture of a great design that urban designers should mimic:
Barrier-free staircase in Vienna’s ninth district. (Image courtesy flickr user: Josef Lex)

This particular design does not require the user to go far out the way from the stairs to get to the top. In turn, they are centered in the middle and thus do not seclude the user to the side. Plus those steps will make for some great public seating.

Conclusion

There are many ways in which city planning can become matriarchal, and much of it has to do with simply accommodating the everyday needs for a woman. Women are on the verge of shattering the “glass ceiling,” and addressing and providing solutions for their largest barrier: childcare. Immediately addressing this would significantly reduce the poverty implications single mothers suffer from. Remedying this can simultaneously be sustainable and adherent with good planning and public policy to mutually benefit everyone.
An Uprising in Egypt: Impacts of the built environment, social media, and urbanization on the 2011 mass protests in Egypt

Terrie Sullivan

Abstract
This paper examines the role of urbanization and globalization in the mass uprisings that swept through Egypt and ultimately deposed dictator Hosni Mubarak in 2011. The revolution that continues to unfold in Egypt is in part a product of the process of urbanization in major Egyptian cities, such as Cairo and Alexandria, and the unique opportunities afforded to city dwellers rather than rural Egyptians. A brief history of urbanization in Cairo is discussed first, followed by consideration of the typical economic and cultural attributes of city dwellers in Egypt. The role of social media and Internet usage in the planning of the protests is examined, along with an analysis of the function played by the built environment of Cairo in the planning and execution of the protests. The paper concludes with a discussion of the impacts of globalization and an online global audience on the international response to the uprising.

"A radical wind is blowing from the alleys and shacks of the latter-day wretched of the earth, surrounded by the fabulous wealth of petroleum."
- Tariq Ali

In 2006, journalist Tariq Ali made the astute observation above, predicting the mass uprisings that would sweep the Middle East in 2011 in what has been called the ‘Arab Spring.’ The revolutions he foresaw bore a distinctly 21st century character. Ali did not warn of a peasant uprising stemming from destitute farmers, or a coalition of migrant laborers fed up with their precarious existence. The ‘latter-day wretched of the earth’ that he spoke of were city dwellers—the professional classes and uneducated poor alike—taking to the streets in defiance. What Ali did not predict, however, was that the revolution would burst from the ‘alleys and shacks’ of Cairo and into Tahrir Square to overthrow dictator Hosni Mubarak. Mubarak was long thought of as a reliable Western ally, protected from any real challenge to his power.

The uprising in Egypt, however, was a revolution years in the making. Beginning in the late 19th century and escalating in the post-war period, globalization had been drawing Egypt further into the world economy, most directly touching the urban population concentrated in cities such as Alexandria and Cairo. With globalization and increased urban development came 21st century technologies that allowed average Egyptians to gather, plan, and ultimately execute a successful mass uprising. The rebellion was a thoroughly urban revolution, characterized by the prominent roles played by the built environment, the global audience, and new technology such as social media. The historic and deeply symbolic Tahrir Square served as the staging ground to a modern revolution where globalization, urbanization, and decades of frustration collided to end Mubarak’s regime.
This paper will dissect the events of January 25, 2011 by examining the interplay of urbanization and globalization in Cairo. Furthermore, we will discuss the role of urbanism—the characteristic methods in which city dwellers interact with the built environment and engage in daily life—in the planning and success of the revolution. A brief history of the complicated and diverse forces that influenced urban development in Cairo will provide sufficient background information for our discussion. We will next consider the unique circumstances and tools at the disposal of many Cairo residents, in contrast to the situation of rural Egyptians. Finally, we will take a close look at how the built environment added both symbolic weight and practical assistance to the activists.

Urban Development in Cairo: 19th – 20th Century Urbanization
To begin, one must consider a recent history of Egypt, specifically the development of urbanization in the nation’s capital and most populated city of Cairo. The process of urbanization in the modern sense—with deliberate planning of public space, land use, and transportation—began in Cairo in the mid 19th century and was heavily influenced by European trends, reflecting the long centuries of Western dominance over political power in Egypt. Under viceroy Isma’il Pasha in the 1860s, large-scale urbanization projects were designed to mimic the wide boulevards and central squares of Paris. Tahrir Square first emerged in this time period; first known as Qasr al-Nil Square, it sat on the eastern bank of the Nile River in between several royal palaces. European models of city planning continued to exert influence through the end of the 19th century and into the post-World War II era. The Westernized housing, shopping centers, and public buildings did not reflect the local culture, however, and created a sharp contrast between the ‘old’ city and the ‘new’ city. Following the 1952 Revolution, many of the European-style buildings reminiscent of the long colonial period were torn down, but for the most part simply reused for state ministry offices. In the 1970s-1980s, one of the most significant factors shaping urbanization was the oil boom in the Middle East. Although not an oil producing nation, Egypt was deeply affected nonetheless. Large numbers of Egyptian workers migrated to oil producing nations and sent significant remittances back home. When the oil boom crashed in the 1980s, the Egyptian economy was hit hard, while Cairo simultaneously experienced a sharp increase in rural-to-urban migration. Overcrowding and a lack of state resources to build new housing or rehabilitate older buildings led to a severe housing crisis. Informal development—the practice of constructing housing without state approval or assistance, using whatever materials are on hand—became increasingly common through the 1990s, with an estimated 50% of Cairo residents living in informal housing by 2000. These homes range from slums to fairly high quality structures, although approximately 8 million Cairo residents were living in slums by 2007.

Tahrir Square is a micro example of the contrast between the West’s imperialistic influence, local culture, and the more recent economic effects of globalization on greater Cairo. As the 20th century wore on, the square continued to evolve, as new buildings were constructed and old buildings repurposed around the periphery. British barracks from the extensive colonial period sat next to the Egyptian Museum on the northern edge, until Abdel Nasser repurposed the barracks as government buildings and a luxury hotel in the late 1950s. While dedicated to ancient Egyptian culture, the museum had largely been staffed by French academics at its inception. Across the Square, many former royal palaces were turned into government buildings or split into expensive apartments over the years. Tahrir Square’s only mosque was built relatively recently at the end of the royal era, giving greater weight to the square’s secular and government-related functions, for better or worse. It is against this complex backdrop that Tahrir Square has taken shape, both physically and symbolically. The Urban Population: the Intersection of Biological Availability and Tech Savvy
Tahrir Square and greater Cairo offered something even more potent than the scent of centuries of oppression—first through imperialism and then dictatorship—in the years leading up to the revolution that ignited January 25, 2011. As the urban population surged and the economy shrank or stagnated at best, the university-educated youth of Cairo were left with little but hope and anger. Unemployed and frustrated, they used their trained minds to examine the serious problems facing their country, all the while confronted daily with the practical results of a government failure to provide for its people. The likelihood of a revolution is often considered parallel to the degree of ‘biological availability’ present. Biological availability is defined as the degree to which an individual is willing and able to risk their livelihood for a revolutionary and inherently risky cause. Young, unmarried, unemployed adults are seen as having very little to lose and much more to gain from taking part in a social movement. They have no family to provide for, no job to worry about losing, and have been pushed to the brink by the systemic failures of their society. In 2011, Cairo was filled with just such a population: a growing number of intelligent, motivated, yet unemployed young adults with high biological availability. The individuals who prodded, nurtured, and finally ignited the revolution did not create their resources out of thin air however; rather, they used the tools of their generation at their disposal, including both the unique built environment of Cairo and the social media tools they grew up with. Actually, the built environment aided the use of social media, as we shall see further on. First, it is important to note that the generation of young adults who grew up blogging and posting on Facebook and Twitter cannot be found in the Egyptian countryside. Rural areas in Egypt seldom have access to the Internet; over 70% of Internet users in Egypt are located in Cairo. While the Mubarak state controlled traditional print and television media, it did not have as firm a hold on access to information provided by the Internet. Furthermore, the Internet offered a meeting space for like-minded individuals without the danger of state police breaking up a meeting. Facebook was the second most popular website among Cairo Internet users after Google in 2011. It was through Facebook, Twitter, and numerous blogs that the activists-turned-revolutionaries were able to stay one step ahead of the regime. Years before the January 25, 2011 uprising, individuals were making connections and spreading information to garner mass support for the eventual overthrow of Mubarak—a feat that would not have been possible without the semi-anonymous world of social media. Multiple smaller protests and strikes were staged in 2009 and 2010, allowing activists to test the use of social media to spread the word about meeting points and times. By 2011, online dissident groups and networks of supporters were well established, enabling the activists to produce a cohesive message, organize specific dates and times for the initial protest at Tahrir Square, circumvent the state media and disseminate information to fellow activists and supporters.

We Are All Khaled Said: A Case study in social media use...
The Facebook group “We are all Khaled Said” underscores the importance of social media to the January 25th uprising. Khaled Said was a 28-year-old Egyptian man from a middle class neighborhood in Alexandria, the second largest city after Cairo. On June 6, 2010, Said was dragged from an Internet café and beaten to death by police in the entryway of a nearby building. According to eyewitnesses, police officers smashed his head against the wall. Official reports suggested that the police were attempting to thwart a drug deal, and that Said died after ingesting a bag of narcotics in his panic to escape arrest. Stories later emerged that Said was at the Internet café to upload a YouTube video that showed police officers taking narcotics from a drug bust for themselves, suggesting that his death was in reality an attempt to stop Said from exposing police corruption online.

Political activists Abdelrahman Mansour and Wael Ghonim, a marketing manager for Google, created the Facebook page “We Are All Khaled Said,” allegedly in honor of a fellow activist. “We Are All Khaled Said” became the largest dissident Facebook group in Egypt, and the group’s thousands of Facebook ‘fans’ proved willing to demonstrate their anger over this injustice in the streets as well as online. The Facebook group was used to organize five separate protests in Alexandria and Cairo between June and August 2010. Mansour and Ghonim kept the momentum of the Facebook group in Egypt, and the group’s followers. Whether the story of the YouTube video is true or not, Said would not have been visiting an Internet café in the rural countryside. His awareness of the United States and a possible life outside Egypt would not have been as strong. What is certainly true is that he was a disaffected youth, discouraged with the prospects of his own nation, and a savvy tech user. Perhaps those reasons alone make Khaled Said the perfect martyr for the Internet generation of Egypt.

The emphasis given to social media thus far is not to suggest that critical face-to-face encounters did not occur. Again, the urban setting of Cairo played a key role in making personal connections between activists possible. The overcrowded city offered multiple points of contact among activists while simultaneously giving them some degree of cover. Dense urban cities give individuals the unique ability to be just another face in the crowd, hidden in plain sight. The sight of several individuals hovered in deep discussion would be a suspicious phenomenon in rural areas. Among a small population, newcomers would stand out and movements would be easily traced. In a large urban setting, however, activists could freely meet on street corners, in coffee houses, or at vendors’ stalls in the market places, and appear to be merely engaging in typical urban life. The Internet cafes provided activists with access to an international audience, but the busy streets and market places allowed for critical one-on-one planning. One innovative and critical method of spreading information from person to person in the days leading up to January 25th were taxi cabs. Explains Waleed Rashed, the co-founder of the political April 6th Youth Movement: Every time I was in a cab, I would call Ahmed on my cell phone and talk loudly about planning a big protest in Tahrir Square for January 25th, because I knew that they couldn’t stop themselves talking about what they’d overheard. Eventually, on January 23rd, a cabbie asked if I’d heard about this big demonstration that was happening in two days.

Under the cover of urban crowding, activists like Rashed were able to casually discuss risky political activity in plain sight. As the uprising transformed from a mass protest to a full-fledged movement and occupation of Tahrir Square, personal connections became ever more critical. Long time political activists and the newly enlightened alike drew together in their long-suffering, determined to out last Mubarak once and for all. An ad hoc camp sprang up in Tahrir Square, a physical representation of the freed society sought by the protesters. Here, the online world and the very real world of ‘workers, students, professionals, working class, middle class and peasants’ came together in solidarity. The protesters organized space for public speeches, established an Internet hub in the square’s center, set up a newspaper wall, a clinic, food stalls, toilets, and lines of barricades at Tahrir Square. Nearly all aspects of city life were compressed and transferred to the square, a city within a city. In this space, the intellectuals and the masses mixed lofty political ideals with very real experience and faced the imminent danger imposed by Mubarak’s regime, “putting their bodies on the front line and taking the blows from the regime’s batons, bullets and blocks of concrete.”

The symbols of globalization and Western intrusion surrounded Tahrir Square were summarily brought down by the occupation camp. The headquarters of the Arab League, the Egyptian Museum—that bastion of Egyptian culture headed by French academics—and the headquarters of Mubarak’s political party all sat along the edges of Tahrir Square. Transportation to and from these institutions of power was severely disrupted if not cut off entirely. Citing Timothy Mitchell’s 1998 work Colonizing Egypt, Dr. Adam Ramadan of the University of Birmingham states: The remaking of Cairo’s urban fabric during the colonial era gave the appearance of a plan, an invisible, meta-physical structure that furthered and facilitated disciplinary power. This structure represented a realm of order, and signified the certainty of that power in the colonial state.
The certainty of that power was what the protesters subverted in Tahrir Square, once the power of the colonial state, inherited by the post-colonial regime of Hosni Mubarak.

The occupation of Tahrir Square wrestled power from Egypt's ruling party and effectively brought Cairo, and thus Mubarak, to its knees. The activists had astutely planned the most symbolic and the most practical location for which to stage a mass protest, one that would grab the attention of the world and thus force Mubarak to take notice.

The Western influence that went into the design of Tahrir Square ultimately contributed to Mubarak's downfall as well. Owing much to the wide boulevards of 19th century Paris, the streets leading to Tahrir Square offered multiple points of entry for large crowds. As the number of protesters swelled, police had difficulty determining the exact route of the march, and were unable to contain the crowds flooding to the square from all directions. The square itself was large enough to embrace the crowd that grew from 80,000 to an estimated 250,000 protesters in less than a week, but was still defensible against Mubarak's thugs. Barricades of automobiles, sentry kiosks, debris—all hallmarks of urban life in Cairo—secured the square from the onslaught of Mubarak's security forces. In this way, the western influences that went into the development of Tahrir Square became complicit in their own demise.

The Western influence that went into the design of Tahrir Square ultimately contributed to Mubarak's downfall as well. Owing much to the wide boulevards of 19th century Paris, the streets leading to Tahrir Square offered multiple points of entry for large crowds. As the number of protesters swelled, police had difficulty determining the exact route of the march, and were unable to contain the crowds flooding to the square from all directions. The square itself was large enough to embrace the crowd that grew from 80,000 to an estimated 250,000 protesters in less than a week, but was still defensible against Mubarak's thugs. Barricades of automobiles, sentry kiosks, debris—all hallmarks of urban life in Cairo—secured the square from the onslaught of Mubarak's security forces. In this way, the western influences that went into the development of Tahrir Square became complicit in their own demise.

The Global Audience Responds

Finally, the seeds of globalization came full circle in Tahrir Square, as a global audience was first shocked by the uprising, and then eagerly cheered it on. Although the Western media did not initially know how to respond to the revolt against Mubarak—a longtime though complicated U.S.-ally in the Middle East—the personal stories of courage and sacrifice told by the activists in their own words ultimately swayed global opinion in the activists’ favor. On February 4, 2011, ten days after the start of the revolution, syndicated New York Times columnist Nicholas D. Kristof wrote: The lionhearted Egyptians I met on Tahrir Square are risking their lives to stand up for democracy and liberty, and they deserve our strongest support — and, frankly, they should inspire us as well. A quick lesson in colloquial Egyptian Arabic: Innaharda, ehna kullina Misryeen! Today, we are all Egyptians!

From Tahrir Square to the United States, through social media and into the mainstream media, the revolutionaries who congregated in Tahrir Square were on the computer and television screens of individuals around the world, speaking for themselves in Facebook posts and 140-character ‘tweets,’ showing the world what they were seeing with uploaded videos on YouTube. Presenting the revolution through their own eyes, the protesters became relatable to urban dwellers in cities as far away as San Francisco, New York, and London in an intimate manner as never before. Whereas Middle Eastern culture has often seemed so disparate to Western audiences, social media broke down those barriers, and suddenly messages of solidarity between the American and British Occupy movements and activists in Tahrir Square flooded the Internet. In October 2011, nine months into the occupation of Tahrir Square, the United Kingdom’s The Guardian published an op-ed piece titled, “To the Occupy movement—the occupiers of Tahrir Square are with you.” The article’s byline listed the author simply as ‘Comrades from Cairo.’

Conclusion

Three years on, the revolution has entered a new phase, or perhaps the next revolution has already begun. The inspiring images of everyday Egyptians taking to the streets were replaced by troubling reports of continued corruption under President Mohamed Morsi, and then his disposal by the Egyptian military. Police brutality and sexual violence against women continues, and in some cases appears to have worsened. Riots on the second anniversary of the revolution in 2013 resulted in nine fatalities and left over 250 wounded throughout the country. Still, the continued protests are a sign that Egypt will not go back to the pre-revolution era. Those ‘latter-day wretched of the earth’ will not silently return to their alleys. It remains to be seen what sort of society will finally emerge from the chaos, but one can almost be certain the world will be watching.

The 2011 revolution in Egypt would not have been possible without the effects of globalization and urbanization, and the consequences these forces wrought on the Egyptian people. Truly an urban and modern revolution, the built environment and the unique characteristics that separate Cairo from the rural countryside—including a population with high biological availability and high instances of Internet usage—were commanding players, nearly as critical as the protesters themselves. Tahrir Square, steeped in Egypt’s history of imperialism and government oppression, set the stage for yet another historic uprising.
Abstract

It is safe to say that most of us have at least some experience with public space, be it a childhood playground, an open plaza, or a pleasant walk through a park. But so few of us realize the greater social implications of these spaces. A simple playground, seemingly lacking in political significance, in reality carries expectations for certain behaviors. Children are socialized in a way that directly corresponds with the design of the area. Planners and city officials create the park and evaluate the design with a specific purpose in mind, often times this purpose dependent on the historical context and values of the time. The investment put into the park is expected to yield some sort of benefit for the city that builds it. Thus a simple children’s playground has far more social implications than one might think. This fact is especially true in San Francisco where land is scarce and highly valuable, making competition for space dramatic and incredibly politicized.

San Francisco’s tumultuous political history, one rooted in debate over space, makes the city an intriguing case study for investigating this relationship. This article will explore the evolution of parks and public space throughout history, and specifically investigate the role San Francisco played in this evolution. It will also investigate current day policies regarding public space in San Francisco, comparing these to modern trends in design. I will conclude with an assessment of public space in San Francisco and what trends to expect in the future.

The Evolution of Public Space: Historical and Theoretical Development

In researching the history of public space, it became readily apparent that there has been a steady evolution in the thinking behind the purpose of parks. Indeed it seems that there is a generational bias in the design of parks, each new generation with “its own set of ideas about how parks can help cities” (Cranz 103). Five very different models of park design can be evaluated: the Pleasure Ground (1850-1900), the Reform Park (1900-1930), the Recreational Facility (1930-1965), the Open Space System (1965-1995) and finally the Sustainable Park (1995-present). Perhaps the most defining characteristic of each park model was design that sought “to address what were considered to be pressing urban social problems at the time” (Cranz 102).

Pleasure Ground (1850-1900)
Pleasure Grounds such as Central Park and Golden Gate Park stemmed “from an anti urban ideal” as a result of industrialization. Parks were seen as “relief from the evils of the city” and a way “to escape” (Cranz 5). Thus it makes sense that these parks took the form that they did, large natural settings with little formalized recreational structure. These parks
were “meant to be pieces of the country, with fresh air meadows, lakes, and sunshine”, such features were expected to “alleviate the problems of city life” (Cranz 5). They were designed with the upper class in mind, and seen as a place to socialize, see and be seen. Park planners “closed their eyes to lower class tastes” hoping that the design would “elevate the lower classes to the level of taste and standard of the middle and upper-middle classes” (Cranz 183). While these parks were technically public, their design encouraged one class of people while discouraging another.

**Reform Park 1900-1930**

Progressive politics of this era resulted in the design standards present in the Reform Park Model. Such parks were “created and run with a reforming zeal” and the principle goal was “to organize activity” (Cranz 61). Playgrounds first began to be popularized during this time, designed to control children’s “natural instinct which would find an outlet in deviant behavior” (Cranz 66). Adults would lead children in organized recreational activities, believing that it would instill proper morals in the young working class. In contrast to advocates of the Pleasure Ground, who saw the park as an escape from industrialization, leaders of this era accepted industrial culture and “began to strive for the integration of its various elements into park programming” (Cranz 78). The goals of the Reform Park were “to reduce class conflict, to reinforce the family unit, to socialize immigrants to the American way of life, to stop the spread of disease, and to educate new citizens” (Cranz 103). Such regulated play for working class children seems to have been used as a strategy to teach future workers rule following behavior necessary for future employment in an industrialized setting as a means to ensure production and profit for the United States.

**Recreational Facility 1930-1965**

While moralistic rationales dominated the previous two models, a lack of purpose can be seen as the defining feature of the Recreational Facility. By the 1930s park leaders, “abandoned their idealistic efforts to use parks as mechanisms of social reform” and concluded that parks “needed no particular justification” (Cranz 101). Booming populations and higher standards of living corresponded with an “increase in demand for park services” (Cranz 103). However, without political justification, parks instead relied on the rationalization that their facilities aided the pursuit of happiness. These arguments were far less convincing and “with the loss of idealism...came a loss of authority and prestige” (Cranz 107). This meant smaller budgets and “intense competition for urban space” (Cranz 121). Parks simply were not given the priority that they were before, and this was reflected in the lack of innovative design. Indeed the identifying design element for this model was simply an emphasis on recreational facilities and a “standardization of all the old elements into a basic municipal package” (Cranz 122).

**Open Space System (1965-1995)**

While the last era was characterized by simple recreational facilities with little advancements in design, this model can be identified by an emphasis on open space, a revolutionary concept in an equally revolutionary period. While the exodus of the middle class to the suburbs arguably started much earlier, by this time the effects of their departure were being felt fully. This loss of population meant that “the demand for park services used during the recreation era to justify parks could no longer be counted on”. Indeed most people began to avoid parks “now considered so unsafe that they were part of the urban crisis rather than its cure” (Cranz 137). Cities had to reinvent themselves, and that included making parks seem “adventurous, colorful, seductive, chic, hip, hot, and cool!” (Cranz 133). In accordance with their name, these open spaces were indeed wide areas that tended to flow easily from park to city. The change in design and purpose “represented a deeper upheaval, indicated by a slogan of the era, Power to the People”(Cranz 139). They became popular places for “be-ins, chalk-ins, and Happenings.” In the 1970s, competition for land became even greater. Officials had to be creative with the space they were given, often developing “small parks that could be tucked into irregular, unusual, inexpensive sites” (Cranz 143).

**Sustainable Parks (1995- Present)**

Considering this generation’s increased concern with environmental sustainability, it should come as no surprise that the current model of park design focuses on constructing Sustainable Parks. In the most general sense, sustainable parks have traits that “increase the ecological performance of parks” (Cranz and Boland 104). Examples include increased use of native plants, responsible water use, emphasis on recycling, sustainable maintenance, etc. They “employ a diverse array of strategies to reduce the need for resources and to increase self sufficiency” (Cranz and Boland 106). Parks may also provide service learning to communities in order to teach how to implement sustainable practices.

**Who’s in Power**

Just as park models have continued to evolve, so have the type of people who control their design. During the Pleasure Ground era, parks were managed by the “social and economic elite, men with considerable power...
and influence, acting out of more or less idealistic motives” (Cranz 158). They were investors who believed they were undertaking a moral imperative, bringing the good of the country to the evils of the city. During the Reform era, “professional welfare agencies began to supplant private charity and philanthropy, and professionalism undermined philanthropic zeal.” (Cranz 168). Social Workers began to take control of recreation, as cities saw parks as an opportunity to reform the working class and teach American values to immigrant children. As the Recreation Facility model took root, so did control by bureaucrats. Where earlier planners saw their duty to be a moral necessity, “bureaucrats tended to identify [the interests of the park] with the mere maintenance and enhancement of their bureaucratic structure” (Cranz 158). As parks lost their moral imperative, they also “gradually received a smaller and smaller share of urban revenues” (Cranz 159).

As parks gain a significant purpose again, becoming a canvas for advocating environmental sustainability, we are beginning to see increasing idealism from the planners and the community organizations behind them. This may result in a corresponding increase in funding for green space.

**History of Public Space in San Francisco**

In analyzing San Francisco’s unique history of public space, I intend to apply these models and theories to historical periods in San Francisco’s history. I’ve divided those historical periods into four main sections, 1850-1930, 1930-1965, 1965-1990, and the transitional period from 1990-2000. After that I’ll begin to detail current trends and how they match the 5th Park Model.

1850-1930: Pleasure grounds and Reform Model

San Francisco was rapidly urbanizing during this time, transforming from merely a backdrop of the Gold Rush into a major metropolitan city. San Francisco was growing into itself, and beginning to define its values and culture. Local park trends exemplified national trends of park design, first beginning with the creation of the ultimate Pleasure Ground, Golden Gate Park. As the Reform Model began to take precedent, San Francisco followed, focusing instead on the creation of smaller neighborhood parks designed to serve specific communities. According to Building San Francisco’s Parks, “The details of San Francisco’s park development are unique, but they fit into the social, cultural, and historic framework of the American Park Movement” (1).

Golden Gate Park’s development in the 1870s was due to a variety of factors. As an emerging city many felt that a park similar to Central Park would help define San Francisco. Value was seen in a large park’s ability to increase property values, encourage tourism, and retain wealth. Such a park “would refresh tired businessmen” and provide an escape from the increasingly urbanized city (Young 120). Indeed by 1854, San Franciscans were already starting to “grumble about the shortage of available green space” (Young 31).

Restrictions that kept San Francisco from acquiring new parkland through 1900 delayed its adaptation to the Reform Model. Golden Gate Park’s expenses created additional delays by “absorb[ing] money that might have been directed toward creating other parks” (Young 14). However, beginning in the first decade of 1900, small parks were developed “in the emerging Sunset, Parkside, Bernal Heights, and Mission Districts, while many of the squares in the older Pacific Heights and Western Addition districts...were finally developed” (Young 9). This increase in small parks was due to increasing ethnic diversity in San Francisco and park commissioners’ “growing recognition of the divergence of social districts within an increasingly heterogeneous San Francisco” (Young 195).

1930-1965: Recreational Facility

World War II mobilized the entire country in joining the War Effort, with San Francisco playing a vital role. In order to make sure the Bay Area could maximize its production potential for war materials, “The Metropolitan Defense Committee...[organized] the Bay Area so that workers, industry, and big businesses” could work together efficiently (Brahinsky, Feldman, Kramer). As part of that organization, the MDC gave different roles to different parts of the Bay Area. East Bay was envisioned as the center for heavy industry, South Bay for light manufacturing and aerospace, and San Francisco as “the center for administration, finance, and San Francisco as “the center for administration, finance, and entertainment, the Manhattan of the West Coast” (Brahinsky, Feldman, Kramer).

It is that designation that is important in understanding the city’s planning priorities during that era, and public space certainly was not one of them. As the war ended, many returning soldiers took advantage of the GI Bill and moved out to the suburbs with their families, resulting in “white flight” from cities. The Bay Area Council worked to support this pattern, envisioning “a system of freeways and the $1.5 Billion Bay Area Rapid Transit System...to bring people from bedroom communities in the suburbs into downtown San Francisco” (Brahinsky, Feldman, Kramer). Considering the lack of ideology behind the Recreation Facility Model,
and the loss of a target population, it should come as no surprise that parks were no longer prioritized in San Francisco.

Most telling of this fact are remarks from Mayor Christopher and the Bay Area Council during a Conference on Regional Recreation Problems of the San Francisco Bay Area held in 1963. Mayor Christopher maintained that “We have a survey of every square inch of San Francisco, but the survey does not show that we have any area that could be converted into recreational facilities” (8). The representative from the Bay Area Council made it clear that her priority was the economy, not parks, stating that we must focus on making “ourselves competitive with other regions of the West in the attraction of new jobs” (10). She argues that the only way to pay for recreation facilities is to first attract new jobs “the attraction of new jobs” (10). She argued that the only way to pay for recreation facilities is to first attract new jobs.

This rediscovered need for open space and corresponding recession heavily strained San Francisco’s Parks and Recreation Department, especially in the period before the passage of Proposition J. In their 1973-1974 Annual Report, they stated “financially dependent on the increasing activism of the park in record numbers” and that they were experiencing “increased demands caused by inflation and the energy crisis”. According to Programs Recommended for Carrying out the Improvement Plan for Recreation and Open Space, published in 1972, the “department [is] seriously over extended. In the past 20 years, the number of facilities under Rec-Park have been expanded...without financial allocations” (12). This problem was further exacerbated by loss of funding from the Federal Government. In a report published in 1973 entitled Financing Open Space For the San Francisco Bay Area Region, it was revealed that “The U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Open Space Lands Program has been a major contributor to the Bay Area, authorizing over 28 million in grants”. However the report goes on to say that “there are strong indications that this program will be eliminated” (3-4).

Despite the large support for open space by residents, it was becoming increasingly difficult to obtain funding to create and protect open space. In order to save money, it was recommended that the city should free “the Rec-Park Department from Facilities which it is not equipped to handle” and that “[Non Recreational Public Facilities in Parks] should be eliminated” (Proposition J 12-13). However even with these changes, San Francisco would still have to think creatively about how to provide recreational opportunities and park space for San Franciscans.

And think creatively they did. Both the Annual Report and Programs Recommended for Carrying Out the Improvement Plan for Recreation and Open Space had a variety of ideas for ensuring open and recreational space for residents on a budget. The Improvement Plan interestingly enough, had a large section on trying to reduce automobile traffic. This was a monumental departure from the priorities of the city in the 50s and 60s, and reflects an exceptional shift in thinking. Even more revolutionary was their idea that “a number of streets should be closed entirely and reclaimed for recreational use”, showing that officials were moving towards taking space back from developers and instead using it for people (Annual Report 14). The report additionally suggests that a network of bike routes should be created to easily transport people to and from parks, an idea that is still relevant today. Perhaps the most creative strategy involved the use of “playmobiles”. In the Annual Report, the Parks and Recreation Department boasted that “Instant Recreation is provided by

At that time, the name of the game was downtown development. To become the Manhattan of the West we needed dense skyscrapers to attract businesses, and freeways to bring in employees from suburbs in the Bay Area. Parks were the last thing on city officials’ minds, a fact perhaps best illustrated by the Golden Gate Freeway proposed in 1964, “which would run through the middle of Golden Gate Park” (Brahinsky, Feldman, Kramer). Throughout the country, parks were increasingly becoming undervalued and underfunded, and San Francisco’s development plans exemplified this pattern.

1965-1990: Open Space

Anti-war Movements were brewing in the late 60s, and San Francisco was leading the charge. Progressive young adults made their pilgrimage to the Haight-Ashbury district to advocate for a new way of life, a trend that did much to change the priorities of the city. San Franciscans residents, perhaps inspired by the increasing activism of the time, started to fight back against the Manhattanization of downtown, effectively outlawing the development of high rises outside of downtown in 1972 (Brahinsky, Feldman, Kramer). “The long postwar era of prosperity and rapid urbanization ended with a crash in the early 1970s” due to the Energy Crisis (Walker 150). The recession, plus the activism of San Franciscans, stunted the movement to Manhattinize. All of this also corresponded with “the dawn of a new era of environmental politics”, that led to “the Bay Area uprising for parks [and] open space” (130). This uprising manifested itself in Proposition J, passed in 1974, serving to “direct a percentage of property taxes towards the City’s Open Space Fund, to acquire new parks and open space” (ROSE 1).

This uprising also led to “the Bay Area uprising for parks [and] open space” (130). This uprising manifested itself in Proposition J, passed in 1974, serving to “direct a percentage of property taxes towards the City’s Open Space Fund, to acquire new parks and open space” (ROSE 1).
two playmobiles [for] persons who live in areas not near playgrounds. With the use of playmobiles, the facilities come to the people” (35). These playmobiles were essentially trailers filled with recreational equipment, a short-term solution for the Parks Department when “high cost and scarcity of available land inhibit purchase and development of permanent parks” (Improvement Plan 17).

Creativity was not restricted to neighborhood parks in San Francisco. Through innovative legislation in 1985 public space was rapidly created and improved in Downtown San Francisco in the form of POPOS (Privately Owned Public Open Space). While POPOS present some “limitations on public access due to their status as a private property” and “cannot substitute for true public spaces” (SPUR), they are an innovative solution in providing open space in the congested downtown area. Since the Parks and Recreation Department was so limited, POPOS were the most cost effective way to ensure public space. While many POPOS were built prior to legislation, they were not mandated and were far less regulated. At that time, they were built either “voluntarily, in exchange for a density bonus, or as a condition of approval”. This density bonus allotted for “an additional 10 square feet of building space for every square foot of plaza space” (SPUR).

But as time went on San Franciscans were increasingly becoming “concern[ed] about the scale and pace of development... [This] led to a number of voter initiatives that would have modified the size and appearance of downtown office spaces”. Creating public spaces merely through density bonuses no longer seemed sufficient, and lax requirements “did not always lead to quality spaces” (SPUR). The Planning Department responded to these concerns by enacting the Downtown Plan in 1985, which “included new requirements and guidelines for the creation of publicly accessible open spaces by developers”. This plan would demand, “a ratio of one square foot of open space for each 50 square feet of occupied office space.” (SPUR).

Such a plan was groundbreaking since it shifted the responsibility of providing public space onto developers, ensuring open space and saving city government funds. The program was largely successful, SPUR’s investigation found that “POPOS generally achieved higher quality than those before 1985”.

1990-2000: Turbulent Transitions for Parks

By the 1990s, San Franciscans had made it clear that they wanted quality public space, but the Recreation and Park Department was proving to be entirely inefficient at providing quality service. Demands were high, and according to SPUR’s Planning for Park’s Renaissance, “staff levels have gone down or remained steady while usage, service expectations, and park acreage have increased”. The department had “earned a reputation as one of the least effective city departments” and was “viewed as one of the most troubled bureaucracies” in San Francisco.

Clearly something needed to change, or else parks were headed towards disaster. Many of these issues were due to a history of underfunding the department, indeed “The 1997 Capital Needs Assessment estimated that a minimum of $125 million is needed” to reverse this trend (Park’s Renaissance). The city had allowed the problem to perpetuate far too long, to the point that maintenance was “funded
by hook or by crook, begging and borrowing from wherever source". Any money the department retained went towards maintenance, meaning that additional projects couldn’t be implemented.

So to address these issues, “SPUR and the Neighborhood Parks Council initiated the Community Parks Task Force”. The task force met over a period of six months to come up with “a comprehensive set of recommendations” that could be utilized to fix these issues. A two part plan was initiated; Proposition A promised $110,000 in bonds, while Proposition C would “allow the Recreation and Parks department to issue revenue bonds, capture revenues in a dedicated revenue fund, hold onto savings generated from departmental efficiencies, and serve as project manager for its own capital projects” (SPUR).

This meant that any savings would be retained by the department instead of going towards the General Fund. In addition it would “establish incentives for organizational efficiency and revenue generation” and require the department to come up with a five year organizational plan to ensure accountability (SPUR). The Parks and Recreation department was completely reorganized to become more effective, with the Community Parks Task Force coming up with more efficient strategies in “management, funding, and policy”. Finally the expectations of the public could be met by a department that no longer struggled with the most basic responsibilities.

Current Trends In San Francisco

Despite the rough patch, San Francisco’s parks have more than recovered and are actively improving. San Francisco’s “citywide average score for a park, rated on over 80 elements, has increased from 81% in FY 2005-06 to 90% in FY 2009-10” (ROSE 15). San Francisco is currently “among the top 5 cities in the country in terms of parkland per resident” and “spend more than any other urban area per resident on parks”. We are also leading the way in developing Sustainable Parks systems. Open space in the Presidio, for instance, has “increased by approximately 64 acres since 1994” (ROSE 28).

The Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of San Francisco’s General Plan was updated in 2009 and includes a myriad of policies conducive to developing sustainable parks and open space. ROSE argues that open space is vital to ensure “a vibrant, civic, livable environment”. The definition of open space “includes urban outdoor areas...[and] components of the public right of way that have been improved to enhance the pedestrian experience” (4). Thus open space becomes more than just a defined park, it becomes integrated into every aspect of the urban framework, “essentially greening” the city. By “making walking and biking more enjoyable, we encourage using alternative forms of transportation and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Beyond simply creating beautiful urban spaces, this trend has a wider ideological goal of increasing sustainable transportation patterns.

The implementation of green connectors, “streets that are designed to significantly calm and/or divert traffic, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle travel, and connect to larger open spaces” exemplify this expanded definition of open space. By initiating traffic calming measures, we can “create additional pocket parks, sitting areas, and opportunities for sustainable plantings, community gardens and other landscape elements”. Another proposed idea is to start developing Livable Alleys “designed with seating, landscaping, and pedestrian-scale lighting” (33). Park(ing) Day, an event birthed by San Francisco artists in 2005, transforms metered parking spaces into vibrant temporary public spaces. The San Francisco Planning Department adapted this reclaiming of parking spaces for pedestrians, creating the world’s first Parklets in 2010 through the Pavement to Parks program. Parklets take parking spaces and transform them into permanent park space, ensuring a more enjoyable pedestrian environment and encouraging walkability. Parklets have been emulated by cities worldwide and solidify San Francisco’s leadership in prioritizing the creation of green urban space.

San Francisco is also setting groundbreaking environmental standards for their park system. San Francisco will “require the inclusion of environmentally-sustainable design principles into all open space construction, renovation, management and maintenance” with an “emphasis on water conservation, recycling/reuse, and storm water mitigation, soil conservation, energy production and efficiency, native and drought-tolerant plants,” (39-40).

San Francisco wants to include community stewardship as much as possible through volunteer programs and “the development of community-initiated...open spaces” (43). Such practices work towards helping residents feel like they have ownership over public spaces in their neighborhoods and encourages service-based learning.

The creation and maintenance of public open space continues to be strongly supported by San Francisco voters. In 2008, and again in 2012, residents approved Park Bonds in record numbers. The first Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond approved in 2008 “provided $150 million in funding to the Recreation and Parks Department and $35 million to the Port of San Francisco for specific voter approved parks and open space recreation projects” (Quarterly Status Report). Currently there are six projects in construction, designed to “fix and improve park restrooms citywide, eliminate serious earthquake safety risks in neighborhood and waterfront park facilities, renovate parks and playgrounds in poor physical conditions, replace dilapidated playgrounds, repair nature trail systems in the city’s park, and attract matching community and philanthropic support” (Quarterly Status Report). The 2012 bond, supported by 72% of voters, “would authorize the city to borrow up to 195 million...to fund repair and improvements of the City’s parks and public open spaces” (Department of Elections).

The 17th & Folsom Park design provides another great example of current park trends in San Francisco. “The plan has been in place since January 2010 will “develop [the] park on a portion of a parking lot at the corner of 17th and Folsom Streets” (Planning Department). The design has received the grant necessary for its construction and is expected to be built by the summer of 2014. The design includes a community garden and greenhouse, fruit trees, a bird and butterfly garden, and a variety of native plants. The park also promotes health through an interactive exercise bicycle area for all ages. Service learning, stewardship, and other education opportunities will be offered, utilizing an amphitheater as an outdoor classroom.

Conclusion

Throughout the process of my research, a number of trends and patterns can clearly be identified. First
and foremost, parks are becoming more and more inclusive. Community members have more power in deciding what kind of parks they want, while planners facilitate the discussion and turn ideas into reality. The City now cares more about serving the desires of the people, instead of developing public space based on their own ideas and theories about how parks should work. Second, parks have finally found a purpose again. Our generation is increasingly concerned about the environment, and that has become reflected in our parks system. Not only do we want to make parks sustainable, we want to make sure those ideals are passed onto future generations through learning opportunities. This newfound idealism has resulted in increased funding for open space, showing that parks are a priority for San Francisco once again. Finally, we want to incorporate green space in areas outside of parks, such as alleys, sidewalks, parklets, etc. This strategy is designed to increase the "livability" of all public space within the city, instead of merely developing parks to escape from it.

As San Francisco works to improve transportation for cyclists and pedestrians, there will likely be an increase in “green connectors” and thus greater connectivity between open space and recreational areas. Greening of public space, through innovations such as parklets, will continue to brighten the urban environment and encourage walkability. Finally, as a major social media and technology hub, we should see more use of these tools in the process of developing parks. Crowd sourcing strategies may be used increasingly as technology improves and residents get more involved in the community process of planning.

While a new model will likely become dominant with the next generation, it would make sense that the strategies associated with sustainable park planning will continue to be used within upcoming models. Environmental issues are likely to stay relevant, so Future Park models should build on current initiatives.

In completing my research, it’s apparent that despite a few bumps in the road, the park system is alive and well in San Francisco. However as history shows, nothing is permanent. While open space is prioritized now, there’s no knowing what decisions future generations will make in regards to planning. As the City continues to evolve and change, we must continue to remember what role parks play in society and pledge to fight for their future.
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Abstract:
This paper will attempt to demonstrate the need for new imaginations of urban futures based on regional-specific, contextual, and inclusive analyses. First, we will explore and establish the theoretical conception of the “Ordinary City,” which calls for the disillusionment of popular urban development standards which assume global relevance. It is argued that these development strategies are based in normative assumptions that produce prejudice growth and impede on organic alternatives. To contextualize this theory we will examine two examples. First we will turn to the recreational park as a project of social engineering to understand how “the racial politics of park development reflects ideologies of land use, histories of property development, planning philosophy, and the spatial expression of racial discrimination” (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p753). Here, the relationship between open-recreational space and land use is understood as highly relevant in public-health discourse and in the material creation of safe, supportive and, healthy communities for the most vulnerable among us. However the political nature of parks will demonstrate a controversial history that has produced problematic recreational spaces and a limited understanding of underlying dynamics. We then turn to an overview of unincorporated communities throughout the San Joaquin Valley. Here we find a compelling complex where unincorporated areas are shut out of infrastructure development due to a rigid road to annexation. Often lacking basic infrastructure, such as clean drinking water, paved roads, and street lighting these regions do not have the fiscal incentive of developable land. As such, unincorporated communities are seen as an economic burden and are denied annexation by neighboring cities. Moreover, due to the disenfranchisement of residents and the evolution of the political landscape, residents are systematically hindered in their attempts to gain annexation. Looking at these phenomena, we can observe the persistent significance of race in the respective examples. As we will see, under the guise of normative practices, cities selectively exclude unincorporated low-income communities of color from basic resources. And throughout low-income communities of color, parks have little impact on urban blight. This reveals a rigid and ahistorical foundation of incorporation politics and park use that systematically produced and maintains severely under resources communities of color.
Introduction:

The trend discussion on social welfare (i.e. the 99%, Arab Spring), calls into question some of our basic societal values. From a planning perspective, this requires an evaluation of urban governance strategies which have direct implications on the distribution of resources and human relations. Perhaps more fundamentally however, I suggest that this moment of social contradiction and critique presents an opportunity to examine the ways in which our discipline contributes to these deep rooted injustices. As discussed in class, popular categorizations of cities as “developed,” “first-world,” or “global,” are increasingly irrelevant. Not only are global underdogs taking on the main stage, but these designations dismiss an array of cities across the world from the global arena. And in fact, these conceptions limit the ability of countless regions to thrive as urban spaces. Arguing that these classifications impose a dichotomous understanding of modernity, where Western cities reign supreme and everyone else is playing catch-up, author Jennifer Robinson calls for a “post-colonial” approach to urban planning that encourages creative, diverse and inclusive solutions for every city. These strategies challenge emotive, economic-oriented solutions hailed by “urban regimes, made up of architects, planners, building and financial speculators, and big corporate interests, for whom urban unity is primarily a matter of papering over real urban social problems and divisions,” embracing instead strategies that engage a more comprehensive scope of the urban community (Robinson, 2006, p421).

This paper will attempt to demonstrate the need for new imaginations of urban futures based on regional-specific, contextual, and inclusive analyses. First, we will explore and establish the theoretical conception of the “Ordinary City,” which calls for the disillusionment of popular urban development standards which assume global relevance. It is argued that these development strategies are based in normative assumptions that produce prejudiced growth and impede on organic alternatives. To contextualize this theory we will examine two examples. First we will turn to the recreational park as a project of social engineering to understand how “the racial politics of park development reflects ideologies of land use, histories of property development, planning philosophy, and the spatial expression of racial discrimination” (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p753). Here, the relationship between open-recreational space and land use is understood as highly relevant in public-health discourse and in the material creation of safe, supportive and, healthy communities for the most vulnerable among us. However the political nature of parks will demonstrate a controversial history that has produced problematic recreational spaces and a limited understanding of underlying dynamics. We then turn to an overview of unincorporated communities throughout the San Joaquin Valley. Here we find a compelling complex where unincorporated areas are shut out of infrastructure development due to a rigid road to annexation. Often lacking basic infrastructure, such as clean drinking water, paved roads, and street lighting in these regions do not have the fiscal incentive of developable land. As such, unincorporated communities are seen as an economic burden and are denied annexation by neighboring cities. Moreover, due to the disenfranchisement of residents and the evolution of the political landscape, residents are systematically hindered in their attempts to gain annexation. Looking at these phenomena, we can observe the persistent significance of race in the respective examples. As we will see, under the guise of normative practices, cities selectively exclude unincorporated low-income communities of color from basic resources. And throughout low-income communities of color, parks have little impact on urban blight. This reveals a rigid and ahistorical foundation of incorporation policies and park use that systematically produced and maintains severely under resources communities of color.

Ordinary Cities:

In her book “Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development,” Robinson explores the implications of a normative discourse on urban development by tracing the intersectionality of race, class, gender and urban studies. Asserting that, “both modernity and developmentalism are products of a colonial past, [having been] defined by early twentieth-century Western scholars,” Robinson situates contemporary conceptions of modernity as a strongly suppressive force in the campaign to revitalize cities around the globe (Robinson, 2006, p4). By domineering a set of urban-modernity standards, through social and geopolitical forces, popular strategies for urban development constrain diverse regions to a limited framework (Escobar, 1988). As outlined by Escobar, these kinds of standards are rooted in the neoliberal complex that used manufactured consent and geo-political institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, to manipulate economies around the globe. Ultimately, these “paradigmatic” standards “expose an analytical tension between assessing the characteristics and potential of cities on the basis of the process that matter from within their diverse dynamic social and economic worlds or on the basis of criteria determined by the external theoretical construct of the world or global economy” (Robinson, 2006, p98). And to the extent that policies are shaped by the latter of these forces, the subjects of these reforms – people - remain shut out and disengaged from the decision making process. In accordance with Amin & Graham’s seminal work on this dynamic, the proposal then is a shift to creative, diverse and inclusive strategies that provide a more comprehensive scope of barriers and opportunities for civic benefits and wellbeing. From a “polito-institutional” perspective, Amin & Graham assert the need for “purposeful action on the part of the state to meet basic needs as well as to encourage open and ‘dialogic’ urban governance; and secondly, a participatory civic democracy centered around creating real opportunities for communities to develop voice and self-determination” (Amin & Graham, 1997, p424). To be certain, relying on such a top-down approach would be antithetical to our goals given the nature of institutional relations of power. Thus, popular social movements and agency, arise as the complementary force, “in opposition to the mainstream. And in many instances, some of the movements are the voice of democracy” (Amin & Graham, 1997, p426). Then a prerequisite becomes the reconstructed relationship between institutional forces and popular agency.

The alternative development paradigm of the “ordinary city” is as useful in struggling cities throughout Africa, as unincorporated communities in the San Joaquin Valley. Indeed, we would be remiss to neglect that “within countries, income differences across regions are as large as income differences across countries” (Robinson, 2006, p36). Then, in spite of a ranking position along the hierarchical arrangement of developed nations, the generous dispersal of suffering under such a framework and relative powerlessness
of the underclass, warrants a great deal of concern, even in the U.S. And indeed there is a rich history of resistance to injustice and struggles for self-determination. Today, popular concern has swelled regarding these realities from Occupy to the Arab Spring, in part accounting for the push in agency necessary to spur more inclusive solutions. This presents legitimate opportunities where incorporating campaigns for increased representation and improved governance may allow cities to take advantage of “projects or senses of social cohesion which serve to provide a genuine sense of collectivity and belonging across the social and spatial divides in a city. This is] propose[d] against the idea that creativity stems from the anarchy of urban diversity, and conflict (… the melting pot), or from projects which seek to hegemonize particular social agendas over a city” (Amin & Graham, 1997, p421). Such a move may serve to increase the perceived legitimacy of the state and have significant benefits for urban governance. It is worth considering that inclusive and participatory efforts build a sense of ownership, entitlement, and community. This “social cohesion” can be harnessed as a force, channeling group effort towards communal benefits. Parks catch wreck

Recently, the Environmental Justice community has made great use of research demonstrating the relationship between space and health. The popular documentary Unnatural Causes has popularized the field of public health and health equity. The land use discipline has a rich history here. As discussed in class, John Snow’s spatial expose of London’s cholera epidemic and Edwin Chadwick’s influential report on sanitary conditions in the nineteenth century spawned the introduction of “biopolitics,” and had a massive influence on the relationship between space, infrastructure, health and government. Moreover, whereas before governing power represented only the rule of punishment, this established the role of governance as a positive force among a population which could provide various forms of care. Like Engels description of the green fields that surrounded the suburban aristocracy, in his account of industrial doom, open green space remains a relevant element in the discussion on civic health (Engels, 1845) (De Chant, 2013). And like the Broken Window Theory of the early eighties, early social reformers began to understand environmental conditions as “medical technologies and… instruments of ecological modernization. Nineteenth century public health theories postulated that maladies were directly linked to land-scape characteristics” (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p746). But like the colonial-mentality that birthed contemporary standards of modernity and development, the relationship between space and health bears a controversial history tainted by the pseudo-scientific basis of eugenics (Kuti, 1981). Through early industrialization, the relationship between social order and white supremacy remained rock-solid. Of course, there were many impoverished whites; however the lowly designation of “inhuman,” “savage,” or “inassimilable,” was generally reserved for people of color. It was exactly this conception of the “other,” a designation of an entire group as so fundamentally different and backward, that justified righteous measures to stabilize “innate” vice, poverty, and incivility. As such, social reformers “imbued parks with the power to overcome anarchy, immorality, crime, and indolence” (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p746). Even among larger trends such as Garden Cities or suburbanization, planning has reflected coded tensions between a dominant culture, and everyone, else. For example, the distinctively American value system which poses a suspicion of city life against the desired tranquility of the countryside is informed by the racialization of space where communities of color are densely concentrated as a matter of necessity for work, or force through institutional exclusion of conventional housing options (Engels, 1845) (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p1666). Thus, parks represent a “microcosm of Jeffersonian pastoral values […] designed to impart civilizing sensibilities and enact elitist ideals of morality and refinement, creating a binary “moral geography’. [This legacy of racist normative dynamics maintain] the park’s image as a natural, sanctifying, wholesome, and White [space,] counterpoising it against the city construed as artificial, profane, insalubrious, and colored” (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p747). These kinds of assimilationist projects have been highly contested and “rather than melting pots”, many parks became ‘pressure cookers” resulting in highly contested and often violent confrontations (Amin & Graham, 1997, p746). And all too often, history has taught us that as discontent goes overlooked, a culmination of unrest is not far on the horizon. Pointing to the lack of research on “how ethno-racial formations might configure park spaces– and how in turn ethno-racially inscribed park space may influence park use or non-use” , Byrne and Wolch provide insight into the normative dynamics at play in contemporary park creation and research (2009, p744). Currently, research on the ethno-racial variance of park use falls into specific categories: marginality, race/ethnicity, assimilation and acculturation, and discrimination, each with a particular line of rationale. Here we arrive at a fundamental crossroad where, presented with a series of options, our choice is directed to paradigmatic offerings that advance a particular outlook as truth. In reality however, social forces and individual choice may reveal a convergence of several determinants. Then, theories which propose a hindrance of park use due to socio-economic barriers may be particularly applicable as opposed to the idea that communities of color have simply “not adjusted to or adopted the dominant values of mainstream society” and therefore do find value in parks (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p749). Or it may be discovered that overt discrimination in parks is less a factor to park use than facilities that are ill-suited to distinct cultural preferences. Still beyond these constructs, research may find that residents avoid local parks because they do not feel safe there. Under an Ordinary Cities framework, variance in ethno-racial park dynamics may be attributed to a convergence of regionally specific forces, not least of which is the spatial effects of systematic racism (which, by the way, is not accounted for in the aforementioned theories) (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p750). This is a more useful analysis, especially in light of great variance among the experiences and characteristics of racial groups and the political geography of a region. As such, Wolch & Byrne draw on various perspectives to advance a conceptual model that provides “a spatially explicit understanding of park use… [and] the development of park resources and access” (2009, p750). These parameters range from; the socio-demographic characteristic of park users and non-users, the political ecology and amenities of the park itself, the historical and cultural landscape of park provisions, and individual perceptions of park spaces (Byrne & Wolch, 2009, p750). Applied in conjunction, the scope of these components allows for a more comprehensive and specialized analysis of relevant forces, which, from a governance perspective, is certainly
beneficial.
The Ordinary City perspective is a worthy model as research on the dynamics of open recreational space and public health moves forward. Its ability to incorporate a diversity of topics makes it a rigorous model founded on accessibility and creative solutions. This openness is a hallmark of the Ordinary City, particularly as urban spaces find themselves thrust into a complex of colliding forces. As such, there is continuously room for reflection and evaluation. Future strategies may include a proposed renovation of the vast network of alleys throughout low-income communities in Los Angeles into open recreational space. Nevertheless, as forthcoming research by Wolch suggests that as creative solutions for parks succeed to intervene in the legacy of race-based resource allocation; rejuvenated park spaces make poor neighborhoods susceptible to displacement as they facilitate a process of gentrification due to increased resources (Wolch, 2013). This paradox demonstrates the need for new strategies as we move toward a just city.

Unincorporated communities:
Examining the impact of housing policies on California’s rural communities, Ramirez and Villarejo document the development of rural slums into modern unincorporated communities. Historically, the agricultural industry had long reaped the benefits of providing quality housing to their workforce. However increased opportunities in World War II’s urban defense industries resulted in a destabilization of a once steady workforce in agriculture. To augment this decline, the American government “formalize[d the] importation of Mexican nationals under what became known as the Bracero Program; this cooperative labor agreement allowed for relaxed regulations on housing, wages, and board for braceros” (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p1665). Thus, as the stream of cheap labor flowed, accounting for massive population growth in the San Joaquin Valley, the agricultural industry chipped away at public housing programs until “farm labor supply centers were brought up to local housing codes, and responsibility for them was transferred to county housing authorities” (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p1665). But despite the prodigious contribution of migrant laborers, local officials refused to accommodate this new demographic by limiting housing stock within their jurisdiction. With nowhere else to turn, “landowners and speculators spurred the creation of communities on what many considered cheap, unproductive lands” giving agricultural workers an opportunity to own small and inexpensive plots of land where they often constructed out of salvaged materials” (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p 1666). These communities, which were located on the urban fringe, lacked basic infrastructure and had limited resources, but were often the only opportunity for home ownership, “particularly for the African American and Mexican agricultural workers who had been denied housing in established cities in the San Joaquin Valley” (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p 1666). This would be the foundation on which rural fringe communities would “become permanent communities; geographical spaces where poverty, race, and labor intersected” (Ramirez & Villarejo, 2012, p1667). Under the dominant political rationale, unincorporated areas (regions within county boundaries but not governed by local municipalities), find themselves in a jurisdictional dilemma. These areas remain saturated with undesirable land uses such as freeways or municipal utility plants, and continue struggling to acquire basic amenities such as safe and reliable drinking water, wastewater treatment, paved roads, and
streetlights. Currently, the most direct route to achieving these resources is through annexation by a neighboring city. This would require the newly annexed territory to be brought up to municipal code thereby providing an upgrade to infrastructure. Annexation is commonplace, however, due to changing dynamics in civil rights enforcement and the validation of the economic rational utilized by municipalities, unincorporated areas with few prospects for supplementing municipal revenue, can only hope of bringing neighboring cities to the bargaining table. This dynamic has maintained a systemic neglect of unincorporated communities as their lack of infrastructure makes them an economic liability resulting in their systematic exclusion from municipal benefits. This condition makes the annexation of most unincorporated area fiscally unsound as, “under the current system of local finance, cities enjoy the legal right, if not the fiduciary duty, to engage in class discrimination when making annexation choices” (Anderson, 2010, p949). As such, even when directly adjacent to or surrounded by municipal territories, unincorporated urban areas find themselves deliberately deserted as adjacent affluent areas get to join the club. The “annexation policies and practices in which cities grow around or away from low-income minority communities” is known as municipal underbounding (Anderson, 2010, p938).

In her research, Michelle Wilde Anderson provides a critical analysis of this process noting that “unincorporated urban areas represent a paradigmatic problem of spatial inequality—pockets of concentrated poverty rooted in a racially ordered community” (Anderson, 2012, p934). The dominant relationships of power have produced arduous and limited options for unincorporated communities to acquire basic amenities. Through municipal underbounding, “City borders have become an important way to sort desirable and undesirable residents, with annexations dependent on the perception, if not the reality, of positive fiscal impacts for the city budget. Even in communities that can show a compelling history of racialized annexation patterns, little can be done as a matter of civil rights law” (Anderson, 2010, p979). That is because historically “unincorporated urban areas and their advocates have deployed conventional tools for change: they have organized locally and they have sued” (Anderson, 2012, p934). However “Over the course of the civil rights movement, courts increasingly came to view local governments as possessing a democratically rooted right to autonomy. To these newly empowered local governments, greater federal deference was due [and] local governments became increasingly insulated from the exercise of federal equitable jurisdiction.” Thus, due to the empowerment of local political economies “the circuit court found on the rationality of the city’s contemporary, race-neutral reasons for excluding the neighborhood, including the net cost to the city of extending services to the development” (Anderson, 2010, p936). Of course, with little incentive, neither municipalities nor private developers take an interest in investing. As such, the legacy of racial discrimination which has produced and maintained these decrepit areas has been rendered irrelevant. This has towards fiscal impact analysis represents a philosophical as well as methodological [choice], because the approach, in its own terms, “ignores all other nonfiscal costs or benefits” (Anderson, 2010, p956). Thus, if annexation requisites remain unimpeded, short of striking oil, unincorporated communities will remain shut out of basic infrastructural development. Addressing this fundamental disenfranchisement, Anderson theorizes a new paradigm which restructures the dispersal of influence, giving greater power to Counties and residents of unincorporated communities. Because unincorporated communities have been largely neglected from the public policy debate, the debate on annexation law has focused on the tension between revenue hungry cities and property rich suburbs opposed to annexation” (2010, p980). Then at the most basic level, any alternative approach should begin by recognizing neglected neighborhoods who actively seek annexation. “In response to municipal underbounding” Anderson suggests “altering local agencies’ authority over annexation by giving counties and their residents a stronger role in negotiating and influencing the terms of annexations” (2010, p979). Creative strategies include granting Counties the power to review annexation proposals and demand and recommend alternatives. Additionally, Counties would be empowered to require an analysis on the “financial effects of the annexation on the residual population” (Anderson, 2009, p897). Residents should enjoy formal protest rights in the event that they stand to be excluded from a neighboring annexation. Following statutory petition requirements, residents may be empowered to disrupt and engage the annexation process. Conversely, Counties may be protected “from annexations that will cherry-pick unincorporated land to leave behind residual territory that is underserved, inefficient to govern, or too costly to serve at habitable standards.” Additionally, negotiating tax breaks with prospective developers may be exchanged for sponsorship of unincorporated communities. Anderson continues; “creative coalitions can be formed among groups targeting health, public services efficiency, environmental mitigation, and social justice. Each of these groups has vested interests in the unincorporated urban areas issue in particular and county power in general” (Anderson, 2010, p992). Indeed this sort of a shift in the annexation process would allow advocates to better engage legislative politics through lobbying and build civic power by aligning their interest and building their base throughout the region. In particular, the environmental and environmental justice camps may align their efforts to have great impacts on the agricultural mecca. Water contamination, unemployment, genetically modified foods, solar energy, wind farms; all these issue are ripe for the campaigning given a little bit of leverage. The current model of annexation politics neglects communities that most are in most need of municipal resources. The prospects for unincorporated communities under an Ordinary City perspective warrant legitimate consideration, particularly in a region where identified neighborhoods have been predominantly Latino and African-American, often with a history of settlement under de jure and de facto segregation” (Anderson, 2010, p937). Nevertheless, the model stands on a foundation of inclusivity and a predisposition to ignorance. In this tradition, Anderson reviews potential negative effects of her proposals and heeds a contextual analysis of the implication in support, and opposition to annexation. These include the familiar concern for displacement based on the potential for increases in property values, taxes, or resource fees which may impact residents differently with respects to tenure. Alternative Nows: At the heart of the Ordinary Cities perspective is the need to utilize new, creative, and inclusive strategies
broader reforms is a vital step if planning is to remain relevant to the diverse urban population. Too often, planning discourse neglects the internal contradictions that exist among its controversial history. But when we fail to challenge our most basic beliefs, “what should be a debate on variety and specificity quickly reduces to the assumption that some degree of interurban homogeneity can be assumed” (Amin & Graham, 1997, p411). This campaign is neither idealistic nor novel; the potential to move this agenda stands monument throughout a history of resistance for a quality standard of living. However the recursive legacy of racism and classism requires a dismantling of normative perspectives, indeed a paradigm shift, in order to “address the inequalities that stretch across and between cities and that sustain poverty in them” (Robinson, 2006, p126). In particular, this means acknowledging unearned privilege, undeserved suffering, and relinquishing power to the historically oppressed. Though safe and accessible parks and unincorporated communities are but two issues in the campaign to absolve institutional repression, understanding their controversial legacy and interconnectedness to
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Abstract
The year is 2026, at ground level, the palpitating machines maintain the utopian City of Metropolis' infrastructure up and running efficiently. The buildings here tower to the sky, above-ground, multi-altitude freeways and rail tracks take the city's inhabitants in all directions with off-ramps leading into the buildings themselves whilst airplanes wizz in the sky dodging the buildings and freeways. This world is the brainchild of Joh Fredersen- master planner and ruling overseer of this magnificent skyscraping urban environment. While this may sound like a perfect world, a deeper look, in this case underground, will demonstrate that not all that shines is gold.

When Maria, the peace-speaking prophet intrudes the majestic gardens full of exotic plants and animals and frolicking vixens designed for the sons of Metropolis' elites, Freder, the son Joh, instantly falls in love with the dame as she presents the little ones accompanying her, “Look children, these are your brothers and sisters”. As quickly Maria went up to see the forbidden (to the lower class) gardens was as abrupt as she and the children were escorted back into the “depths”. The incurably enamored Freder
the director imagined the tendency of oppression and exploitation of the poor so persistent, that by the year 2026, the existence of the middle class would be virtually nonexistent, leaving only two extremely polarized classes: the super rich, and the extremely poor.

This article will briefly examine and discuss the elements of the built environment portrayed in the film, as well as some societal dynamics of the classes based on their socioeconomic status. Taking into consideration the era this movie was filmed (1927) explains a great deal to the degree of the extent Fritz Lang’s imagination could take him to creating this futuristic world. By observing Fritz Lang’s conceptualized City of Metropolis, one can see how densely built the city was constructed, the mechanical technology employed, and the various modes of transportation.

Historically, in the 1920’s, ‘great cities’ were still prevalent. This was the time when propaganda for suburbanization began, and it was the time when people began to be mobilized by the automobile. The great city was home to all forms of classes from diverse backgrounds. In 1925, Park and Burgess from the University of Chicago came up with the Concentric Zone Model where they explained how members of the city were segregated based on demographics and economics. They found that surrounding Chicago’s hub of the central business district were the lower class minorities. As one ventured outward, every concentric ring passed typically equated a higher class of inhabiting members until the elite commuter zone was reached (Burgess p. 166-167). Throughout the film, the built environment of Metropolis did not possess relatable characteristics to categorize with as other spatially organized cities in its time. The layout of Metropolis did not match the Concentric Zone Model (1925), Hoyt’s Sectoral Model (1939), nor Harris and Ullman’s Multiple Nuclei Model (1945). Lang envisioned a future so segregated that anything above ground level was forbidden from the lower classes, thus they were confined to operating the subterranean machines that maintained the city. Though there will be further elaboration of this topic later in the text, we will proceed with Metropolis’ aesthetics of the built environment.

Art Deco was a style very popular in the 1920’s era. As the dominating trend of the time, Lang’s Metropolis Art Deco styled architecture stood out as the dominant aesthetic of the built environment. It was found from the central prominent Babel Tower in the movie, to the machines and the depths of Underground City. Advancing technologies of the time; both the telephone, and aerial transportation brought about the greatness of the 2026 city of the future. In 1968 Melvin Webber wrote in The Post-City Age, “reflecting on the current explosion of science and technology [the] increasing ease of transportation and communication is dissolving the spatial barriers” (Webber, p. 550). Referring to the advent of the airplane and the telephone, in retrospect, both Lang and Webber’s predictions of their potential influence in this case were true. Although Metropolis had the densified characteristics of Le Corbusier’s “Contemporary City” (1929), the way true life enfolded in the US, for the most part, was rural or sprawled (similar to Frank Lloyd Wright’s 1935 “Broadacre City”). However the case, Lang still portrayed the automobile as the main form of transportation while the City of Metropolis still maintained an apparent thriving rail infrastructure as an alternate form of transport. It is interesting to note also that the increase in population of the City of Metropolis equated for vertical construction rather than to build in low-density form and to the peripheries (such as the auto-dependent design of Radburn, New Jersey suburb developed in 1929). The reason that the film portrays the city in this form is because the automobile had yet to become such a tremendous factor to the contribution of sprawl. In the US, suburbs themselves did not become the preferred way of life until after WWII. In 1923, Kansas alone had more cars than France and Germany.
combined (Jackson, p. 162). Take into consideration also that the storyline of the film, the set, the assembly of actors, etc., must have been organized a few years prior to the movie's premier in Germany as of 1927.

Design Physically Manifested
If the built environment is a reflection of our values, then the City of Metropolis illustrates poor societal morals in regards to equity and justice. Having said that, modernism at the turn of the 20th century was becoming the new style throughout the world. Through design then, the person with the capital to build possessed tremendous power, “The twentieth-century planner typically presented one best solution that would separate different physical uses and social strata, enhance efficiency rather than equity, and for the most part, aim at bland uniformity” (Fainstein p. 4). In the film Joh Fredersen became the designer and perpetuator of oppression and manipulation of the two existing classes, both the low and high. Day after day, in an automatic routine the workers living below operated the machines allowing the functioning infrastructure of the fabulous city above. In a way, Lang predicted that if the rate of ‘business as usual’ continued in the world, this extreme polarization of classes would occur. The fact that Lang’s city does not match any of the previously listed models, demonstrates also the degree to which the workers were so undesirable to live amongst the rich, that they shunned them below ground where they do not even share the same air. In other words, the tendency to localize poor or minorities in a concentrated area was not low enough to what they deserved. Freder screams at his father, “Why do we treat the workers so badly? It was their hands that built Metropolis... but, where do the hands belong in your scheme!?”. Mr. Frederson responds... “in their proper place- The Depths!”. It was these statements that led me to the epiphany that even still, the irony of our contemporary cities is that those who erect our towers, assemble technology build the machines that will someday replace us, and even build the humblest of homes, they are built by the same hands, and planned by those with the capital and power.
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In conclusion, the message throughout the film is “between the mind that plans and the hands that build there must be a Mediator, and this must be the heart”. While this can and should be applied in a literal context, this too can serve as a metaphor to what was missing in the film- the middle class. The middle class is important in order to sustain a thriving democracy. And just as important as democracy is the form of the built environment for the consequences it bestows to its citizens as contributing part of it.
Housing Shifts in Amsterdam

The City’s Relation to the “Right to the City”

Abstract

The transformation of Amsterdam from a sanctuary city for ethnic groups to a region overtaken by neoliberal policies is a highly visible process. The city’s landscape has shifted from a cultural explosion to a predictable urban environment that acts as a harbor for a more affluent crowd. In view of these recent changes in Amsterdam, this paper explores a central question: does Amsterdam live up to its reputation of a just city or have its citizenry become secondary to maintaining its status of a global city? In answering this question, this essay embarks upon the literature of “The Right to the City” to interpret the various policies since the post-war years, and the role of the state in relation to marginalized groups such as squatters, minority ethnicities, and refugees. As the allocation of space within a region is indicative of their interests and the route that its leaders have chosen to invest in (Castells 1989), this paper also intends to demonstrate a reality that a city can make social justice secondary to its financial agendas, and to further ascertain the possibility of Amsterdam to return to an inclusive city or continue to become an exclusive region.

Amsterdam’s Relation to “The Right to the City”

Throughout the global cities that serve as areas of commerce for the rest of the world, there is much speculation about the livelihood of their native populations. While the residents are utilized as labor for the production of the city’s renowned sectors, their needs are often secondary to their role in the local economy. Therefore, it is vital to establish a theoretical concept that could help the city government account for both the role of citizens and their earned rights. In the latter half of the 20th Century, social philosopher Henri Lefebvre initiated a movement named “The Right to the City”, which addressed the exploitation of working class by bourgeois interests with an emphasis on spatial justice to resolve classist practices.

Henri Lefebvre’s Tenet and its Relation to Amsterdam

The fundamental idea of “The Right to the City” is to incorporate each individual into a functioning city regardless of their socioeconomic standing. Lefebvre’s movement advocates for mixed-use space to create an inclusive environment that does not revolve around a singular interest. Lefebvre was particularly intrigued by the city of Amsterdam’s focus on social housing and integration of working class individuals within policy decisions. By 1970, approximately 75% of all housing in Amsterdam was constructed, appropriated, and maintained by the city government. Despite this strong start, since the 1990’s, the city has often opted for market-driven benefits in new residential construction throughout the city. This essay modestly aims to
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civic engagement”, while promoting
as described by Edward Soja, “a city
employment-driven reasons. The city
necessity of occupying a space for
residents’ ties to local culture to their
encompasses everything from the
physical activities that occur within it
a daily basis. Lived space, therefore,
encompasses everything from the
residents’ ties to local culture to their
necessity of occupying a space for
employment-driven reasons. The city
of Amsterdam until the 1990’s was,
as described by Edward Soja, “a city that fosters a culture of tolerance and
civic engagement”, while promoting

equity through its allegiance to being
a welfare state (Uitermark 2012, p. 4). The tenet of Lefebvre’s “The Right
to the City” looks to “fundamentally
shift control away from capital and the state...toward urban inhabitants” that reside in the deep centers of
cities (Purcell 2008, p. 101). Rather
than allowing the market to dictate
the structure of city, there should be
significant input from its existing
residents. The Squatting Movement
in Amsterdam demonstrated the
city’s recognition of “The Right to
the City”, which contributed to an
intensification and radicalization of
resident protests and saw immigrants
looking to rebuild Amsterdam land
housing on the periphery (Uitermark
2012).

The Keynesian Approach:
Amsterdam’s Efforts Towards
Equitable Living

As the city of Amsterdam often
possesses a Keynesian mentality
in accommodating and investing
in its citizenry, equitable housing has always been a primary focus in
creating an overall functioning city
(Fainstein 2011). While many of these
ideals rooted in the principals of the
landmark legislative bill, the Housing
Act of 1901, much of the attention
devoted to the system was spurred by
communities that mobilized against
dissatisfactory housing. In order to
sustain this system in the latter half of
the 20th Century, specific guidelines
were put in place to maintain the city’s
mission of preventing disenfranchised
communities. One notable example is
the creation of the point system
(puntensysteem), a comprehensive
system to determine fair rent based on
the property’s standard, size, location,
and amenities (Uitermark 2012). The
strict governmental restrictions
and curtailment of landlord duties
significantly reduced the capitalization
ability of property ownership. As such,
individual status was not enhanced
through the claim of property, but
rather through the ability to obtain a
premier location with a comfortable
budget. Furthermore, in looking at
the social housing policy decisions,
government-financed housing
(woningwet-woningen) was the only
type constructed on a large scale and
given priority (Nell & Rath 2009).
Moreover, the government
housing departments set criteria to
determine tenants’ eligibility, such
as age requirements, allowing more
individuals to occupy a flat during
the 1980’s. These housing codes were
ultimately contingent on universal
justice and transparency. They were
made possible in Amsterdam because
government-financed housing this type of property was only
granted under specific circumstances
or to large families that could be
accommodated no other way. With
strict housing regulations, between 1945 and 1985 about 90% of all new
housing in Amsterdam was social
rented housing (Van de Ven 2004).
The city’s embodiment of left-wing
ideals has reached its peak, given
the development of Amsterdam over
the last three decades has clearly
demonstrated the city’s return to
market forces. This is evident in the
epitomization of social housing,
peripheral business development,
and owner occupation in three major
developments throughout the city: the
Bijlmermeer, Amsterdam South Axis,
and the harbor islands respectively
(Uitermark 2012). The city became
increasingly aware of the marginal
opportunities it provided for incoming
by demolition of historic buildings
for new housing developments. With
strong opposing sentiments against
this repurposing of property and
equal distribution of housing, many of
these residents went off to seek a less
restrictive social order in the comfort
of nearby suburban communities. New
houses in surrounding towns such as
Uithoorn, Purmerend, and Almere
particularly attracted the middle
class by offering decent quality for
moderate rental prices (ibid.). Affluent
individuals either remained in more
exclusive quarters of Amsterdam or
felt compelled enough to move out
of reach from the city altogether.
Accordingly, Amsterdam began to
shift from a centralized city model to
an urban environment in which power
was dispersed amongst different
sections of the city.

The city managed to continue its
revitalization without displacement
by converting former ports, industrial
factories, and slums containing
leftover rubble. Though the state
began to allow a few owner-occupied
housing, this type of property was only
granted under specific circumstances
or to large families that could be
accommodated no other way. With
strict housing regulations, between 1945 and 1985 about 90% of all new
housing in Amsterdam was social
rented housing (Van de Ven 2004).
The city’s embodiment of left-wing
ideals has reached its peak, given
the development of Amsterdam over
the last three decades has clearly
demonstrated the city’s return to
market forces. This is evident in the
epitomization of social housing,
peripheral business development,
and owner occupation in three major
developments throughout the city: the
Bijlmermeer, Amsterdam South Axis,
and the harbor islands respectively
(Uitermark 2012). The city became
increasingly aware of the marginal
opportunities it provided for incoming
residents, leading to economic shift and gradual disconnection with the working class.

In the citizen-oriented culture that permeated Amsterdam throughout the late 1960’s and 1970’s, squatters were a huge asset to the conservation about working class rights, while being a huge disturbance to middle-class residents. Some sections of the city were particularly threatened by the government’s demolition plans of social housing in the Nieuwmarkt area to create more private homes. Vacancy rates accelerated in anticipation of demolition, and squatters began to occupy the newly cleared housing units (Uitermark 2004). Their heavy presence in these sought-after quarters prevented the government from knocking down approximately 80% of the buildings, barring further urban renewal in the center of Amsterdam. Though the citizens have historically been opposed to the squatter’s movement, many of them were grateful for the stand that these nomadic protestors took against the government. These individuals went one step further in demanding the city and successfully fought for construction of new houses, maintenance of existing housing stock and democratization of city planning processes. Though these movements set the tone for the rest of the 1970’s in creating a left-wing planning department and by fashioning an agenda that met the needs of the time, the ailing economy in the 1980’s produced an environment that called for housing to be created for the benefit of market.

**Urban Renewal: Spatial Integration and its Effects on the Working Class**

The city of Amsterdam’s investment in urban renewal can be attributed to the notion devised by city planners that stated “segregation was [a blockade for Amsterdam’s overall progression] … as it would create a lack of understanding” between residents and foster a xenophobic social environment (Musterd 1997, p. 158). As the city operated off of such a belief, the city began to look to more Anglo-Saxon cities for methods of urban renewal and took to their communities with immediate construction. In addition to creating new housing units in existing ethnic areas, the city also sought to transform the social housing into mixed-income housing. This process was fixated on the notion that if low-income Surinamese and Turkish families were the only residents, such “social isolation could lead to the ghettoization of their communities” (Musterd 1997, p. 160). For these community members, this logic was hard to follow, as they had been living in tenement housing that benefited from rent control and subsidized utilities for the last 15 years without any threat of displacement. According to scholar Rinus Derloo, many ethnic residents feared the impacts of the newly forged interest in their affordable housing communities, as there had already been a growing shortage of rent-subsidized housing available to the working class. This fundamental shift sought to transform areas such as the Bijlmermeer, “altering the landscape from an exclusively social-rented housing project to one with a more heterogeneous population adjacent to shopping and office schemes has been continuing for some time” (Fainstein 2005, p. 471).

In looking for the policies enacting of urban renewal processes, this position is articulated in key documents such as De Gedifferentieerde stad (The Differentiated City) (1996) and the Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing (Report on Urban Renewal) (1997) (Musterd 2003). Amsterdam’s planners rationalized new development as a cure to the poisonous "income neighborhoods", which they labeled as the product of market conditions. This was simply their justification for "tearing down various tenement and historic buildings, while propping up … bland concrete or pre-fabricated structures" on the city's periphery (Fainstein 2005, p. 473). Not only did these urban renewal projects present practical issues for the working class population, but also contributed to a dwindling community involvement in the formerly close-knit and productive ethnic neighborhoods. It was apparent that "socio-economically mixed districts score lower on volunteering and neighborhood trust than more homogeneous areas (Veldboer & Bergstra 2011, p. 3).” As the existing residents withdrew from civic and social engagements in communities such as the Bijlmermeer, a negative dynamic between the disadvantaged and the educated became apparent. The catalyst for such social policy change was not necessarily the city’s attempt to connect various social groups, but instead to attract new demographics into the suffering Amsterdam housing market (Cortie et al. 1989). With a declining population from 850,000 in 1960 to 675,000 in 1985, the city saw the need of attracting middle-class and affluent white-collar workers to boost the overall tax revenue. This fiscal imperative animated the city’s endeavor to beautify sections of the city through gentrification practices (ibid.).

**Widespread Gentrification: The Eviction of the Working Class and Their Plight**

The redevelopment practices that sought to diversify Amsterdam’s demographic composition and to increase its tax base reshaped both the middle-class and social housing areas. As urban renewal policies have been known to displace poor minority households from their neighborhoods, the policies meant to create social cohesion essentially diminished the overall equity and democracy in Amsterdam (Fainstein
2008). Since 1998, the city has worked to increase the number of owner-occupied dwellings, which would take effect primarily in the central areas but also on the city's outskirts that had been reserved for low-income individuals in a very pervasive manner (Veldboer & Bergstra 2011). The post-war neighborhoods that contained mixed-income housing have since been demolished (as of 1991) for the aforementioned urban renewal projects, while pre-war neighborhoods are undergoing gentrification through the sale of social and private rental housing (ibid.). Through the robbery of both havens from those that access social housing, their options have become rather limited as they become less relevant to the city's future plans.

The environment of Amsterdam's housing market is primarily shaped by two types of gentrification. The first, known as “mild gentrification”, is described as a natural succession that takes place without social eviction, therefore sustaining diversity in the neighborhood (ibid.). The second is “strategic or orchestrated gentrification”, which involves governmental action to remove inhabitants from their property to implement a new form of social environment. Both approaches have been adopted in planning Amsterdam – but the mild gentrification approach is more frequently practiced due to lower costs and the fact that it causes minor social friction.

Neighborhoods that have been hit by gentrification in recent years are De Pijp in 2005 and Westerpark in 2008. In view of the stark contrast of Amsterdam's housing market, which went from over 75% of social housing to fewer than 41% in 1998, scholar Susan S. Fainstein compares housing to fewer than 41% in 1998, which went from over 75% of social of Amsterdam's housing market, 2008. In view of the stark contrast in De Pijp in 2005 and Westerpark in Neighborhoods that have been hit lower costs and the fact that it causes – but the mild gentrification approach possible were precisely the same gentrification irreversible (Uitermark 2012). This Fordist approach was coupled by the implementation of other neoliberal policies such as VINEX (Vierde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening Extra, as know Fourth Memorandum Spatial Planning Extra), which allowed for large-scale housing areas in and adjacent to cities to be 80% newly built owner-occupied and at least 15% social housing (Kadi 2011). The housing market restructuring alleviated the government from housing duties and resulted in bizarre outcomes. While working class people pay relatively high price for housing, affluent individuals manage to acquire rent-controlled housing. Between 1974 and 1995, the gradual shift to a neoliberal housing market rendered privately owned housing as common as social housing. Despite this steep drop over the two decades, the city of Amsterdam actually remained highly involved in housing policy decisions and retained its namesake as a social housing city.

A Step Above the Rest: Amsterdam Remains the Most 'Just' City

Amsterdam may have lost a significant number of social housing units and the reputation of a socially just city. Nevertheless many scholars still regard the Netherlands’ capital as the most equitable global city. Fainstein, for instance, states that though Amsterdam had not engaged in similar office-building schemes to those of New York City and London during the preceding decades but had rather placed its emphasis on enlarging its housing stock” (2008, p. 769). Since the start of the new millennium, the city had been using the new corporate office buildings such as ING that located on the city’s edge as a justification to create housing for their employees. The previous mechanisms that made equitable housing market possible were precisely the same policies that had been adopted in planning Amsterdam - but the mild gentrification approach made gentrification irreversible (Uitermark 2012). This Fordist approach was coupled by the implementation of other neoliberal policies such as VINEX (Vierde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening Extra, as know as Fourth Memorandum Spatial Planning Extra), which allowed for large-scale housing areas in and adjacent to cities to be 80% newly built owner-occupied and at least 15% social housing (Kadi 2011). The housing market restructuring alleviated the government from housing duties and resulted in bizarre outcomes. While working class people pay relatively high price for housing, affluent individuals manage to acquire rent-controlled housing. Between 1974 and 1995, the gradual shift to a neoliberal housing market rendered privately owned housing as common as social housing. Despite this steep drop over the two decades, the city of Amsterdam actually remained highly involved in housing policy decisions and retained its namesake as a social housing city.

The rate of individuals moving after eviction, therefore sustaining diversity in the neighborhood (ibid.). The second is “strategic or orchestrated gentrification”, which involves governmental action to remove inhabitants from their property to implement a new form of social environment. Both approaches have been adopted in planning Amsterdam – but the mild gentrification approach is more frequently practiced due to lower costs and the fact that it causes minor social friction.

Neighborhoods that have been hit by gentrification in recent years are De Pijp in 2005 and Westerpark in 2008. In view of the stark contrast of Amsterdam's housing market, which went from over 75% of social housing to fewer than 41% in 1998, scholar Susan S. Fainstein compares housing to fewer than 41% in 1998, which went from over 75% of social of Amsterdam's housing market, 2008. In view of the stark contrast in De Pijp in 2005 and Westerpark in Neighborhoods that have been hit lower costs and the fact that it causes – but the mild gentrification approach possible were precisely the same gentrification irreversible (Uitermark 2012). This Fordist approach was coupled by the implementation of other neoliberal policies such as VINEX (Vierde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening Extra, as know Fourth Memorandum Spatial Planning Extra), which allowed for large-scale housing areas in and adjacent to cities to be 80% newly built owner-occupied and at least 15% social housing (Kadi 2011). The housing market restructuring alleviated the government from housing duties and resulted in bizarre outcomes. While working class people pay relatively high price for housing, affluent individuals manage to acquire rent-controlled housing. Between 1974 and 1995, the gradual shift to a neoliberal housing market rendered privately owned housing as common as social housing. Despite this steep drop over the two decades, the city of Amsterdam actually remained highly involved in housing policy decisions and retained its namesake as a social housing city.

A Step Above the Rest: Amsterdam Remains the Most 'Just' City

Amsterdam may have lost a significant number of social housing units and the reputation of a socially just city. Nevertheless many scholars still regard the Netherlands’ capital as the most equitable global city. Fainstein, for instance, states that though Amsterdam had not engaged in similar office-building schemes to those of New York City and London during the preceding decades but had rather placed its emphasis on enlarging its housing stock” (2008, p. 769). Since the start of the new millennium, the city had been using the new corporate office buildings such as ING that located on the city's edge as a justification to create housing for their employees. The previous mechanisms that made equitable housing market possible were precisely the same policies that had been adopted in planning Amsterdam - but the mild gentrification approach made gentrification irreversible (Uitermark 2012). This Fordist approach was coupled by the implementation of other neoliberal policies such as VINEX (Vierde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening Extra, as know as Fourth Memorandum Spatial Planning Extra), which allowed for large-scale housing areas in and adjacent to cities to be 80% newly built owner-occupied and at least 15% social housing (Kadi 2011). The housing market restructuring alleviated the government from housing duties and resulted in bizarre outcomes. While working class people pay relatively high price for housing, affluent individuals manage to acquire rent-controlled housing. Between 1974 and 1995, the gradual shift to a neoliberal housing market rendered privately owned housing as common as social housing. Despite this steep drop over the two decades, the city of Amsterdam actually remained highly involved in housing policy decisions and retained its namesake as a social housing city.
Works Cited:


