

**GEOGRAPHY 858: SEMINAR IN ENVIRONMENTAL & LAND USE
PLANNING
Spring 2007
7:00-9:45pm Tuesday in HSS 366**

Professor: Jason Henderson, Department of Geography
Office: Room 269 **Office Hours:** Tuesdays 5:30-6:30pm or by appt.
Phone: (415) - 405-2483
Email: Jhenders@sfsu.edu
Web: <http://bss.sfsu.edu/jhenders/>

Course purpose, themes and objectives:

Geography includes understanding human interaction with both the built environment and natural environment. In the US this sort of interaction is pronounced in metropolitan areas, where 80% of people live, and where profound ecological and social problems are promulgated by everyday life. Concomitantly, many solutions to deepening ecological and social problems in modern society will have to include rethinking how we have organized our cities and everyday life. This course is designed to provide a broad overview of a number of contemporary conceptual issues and debates about our cities and their social and environmental impacts.

We will use contemporary land use and environmental planning debates as a platform for critically thinking about how the spatial organization of our built environment impacts society and the environment. Topics will include a history and review of contemporary American land use and environmental issues and the relationship between planning, urbanism, and environmentalism. Emphasis will include debates surrounding "sprawl," "new urbanism," and "smart growth," as well as the spatial relationship between land use and transportation, housing, and a special section on the land use implications of the disaster in New Orleans (at the end of the semester).

The seminar will also emphasize comprehensive/general plans and environmental impact analysis, and students will be expected to integrate theory with everyday planning issues in the Bay Area and beyond. The seminar will conclude with presentations of students' research on an approved land use or environmental planning topic. The goal of the seminar is to incorporate theory and practice into a solid geographical understanding of contemporary land use and environmental issues.

Prerequisites:

Geog 801: Scope & Method and Geog 658, or similar courses. **ALL students must have had GEOG 801 or an equivalent course to be in this seminar. It is assumed that you have experience with academic research, heavy reading loads, and academic writing. All students are also expected to have taken Geog 658 or a similar course that introduces land use planning and policy. Graduate students must have achieved a "B" or higher in both 801 and 658. It is assumed that you know the basic themes and concepts in contemporary land use planning. No exceptions are made.**

Required Texts & Readings:

Required reference text: Fulton, W. (1999 or 2005) *Guide to California Planning*, 2nd or 3rd edition. (3rd edition preferred). It is assumed that you took Geog 658 and have this book. If not, you must acquire a copy). Throughout the semester you should refer to this text to get background on the weekly topic. References will be made to the Fulton (2005) but the 2nd edition (1999) is adequate.

Required books: (all available at SFSU bookstore or elsewhere):

Bruegmann, R. (2005). *Sprawl: A Compact History*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Dittmar, Hank, and Gloria Ohland. (2004). *The New Transit Town: Best Practices in Transit-Oriented Development*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

Frumkin, Howard, Lawrence Frank, Richard Jackson (2004). *Urban Sprawl and Public Health: Designing, Planning, and Building for Healthy Communities*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

Assigned articles. These articles are accessible two ways:

1. On reserve in the map library
2. I will lend you clean copies that you can share in photocopying.

Grading & expectations:

Attendance, completion of all readings, & participation in class discussion (10 pts):

This is a discussion-oriented seminar. You are expected to complete all readings, provide oral summaries for each reading, and be prepared to offer critical evaluations of what you read. **IF YOU MISS CLASS YOUR DISCUSSION GRADE DROPS 5 points, no exceptions except for family emergency. IF YOU MISS TWO CLASSES, YOUR GRADE DROPS 10 points. IF YOU MISS MORE THAN 3 CLASSES, YOU WILL BE DROPPED FROM THE CLASS.**

Reaction Papers (10 pts): Each student will complete 2 reaction papers in response to topics discussed and read in the seminar. Students will be divided into groups and assigned certain dates to be discussion leaders - using the reaction papers as a guide. Each reaction paper should contain a critical analysis of the readings. Additionally, each discussion leader should conduct research into how the topic is manifested in contemporary land use or environmental issues in either the Bay Area or California. Discussants should be prepared to explain the linkages to the class. Scheduling of reaction papers & discussion leaders will be settled in the first week of class. Format of reaction papers is explained below.

New Orleans (5 pts): Provide a critically informed set of ideas about how New Orleans should be rebuilt. Write a 3-page set of recommendations in a bulleted but clear manner. Make sure that your ideas are informed by your understanding of the broader environmental and social context. Make sure that any ideas that you propose are technically realistic and have been deployed somewhere else. Enhance your suggestions by referring to recent media coverage.

Semester Paper (50 pts.): The research paper may be a conceptual theoretical paper or it may be more empirical, although conceptually situated. Land use and environmental planning are fairly broad fields, and so many topics would fit in this course. You are encouraged to produce a paper related to your thesis research topic or you can use the paper as an opportunity to develop a thesis proposal. If you are unsure if your paper idea fits with the course please see me. A working proposal will be due midway through the semester and you will be expected to discuss your idea for a paper in class. More guidelines on the paper follow below.

Final Presentation (25 pts): Each student will present his or her research to the entire class. Each presentation should last about 20 minutes, with 10 minutes reserved for question and comments. All students must attend all presentations and be prepared to comment, critique, and discuss. Presentations will occur in the last classes of the semester. More guidelines will be discussed in class.

Guidelines for Reaction Papers

Each student will write two reaction papers, one each for a specific week during the semester. The papers will be due at the end of class on the date in which you will also be a discussion leader, and you will use the paper to guide discussion. Each paper should be between 4 and 5 pages in length, typed, double-spaced, and double-sided if possible. *Papers cannot be turned in as email attachments.*

In each reaction paper, you literally "react" to what you have read. Do not simply summarize the readings. You should identify the main arguments in the readings. You may want to take one major point and critique, debate, or sort through its implications. You should also situate your reaction paper – that is, relate it to the wider course themes, other readings, and discussions that occurred in class.

Here is a general guide:

In the first paragraph or half-page state what you see as the main points and arguments of the readings or problems posed by the author (s).

Then, in 2 pages, take on one or two main points or arguments you want to identify, and discuss critically. It is advisable to relate it to your own research interests. Are there confusing elements of the arguments? How does the point you have chosen relate to the wider course or discussion in class? This is the place where you formulate discussion questions for the class.

Relate to Bay Area or later, relate to the debate about rebuilding New Orleans

Explain your own reaction the argument or point you have decided to emphasize. Compare it to other readings.

Finally, provide 1 or 2 succinct questions that you would like the class to address in discussion.

Make sure you cite all references in text AND in a list of references (references do not count towards reaction piece length)

Final Paper & Presentation

Prepare a well-developed and fully cited paper approximately 20 pages in length, plus maps, illustrations, and a bibliography. You will present your paper to the class at the end of the semester. **Assign one interesting article to the class to read the week before your presentation.**

You should conduct research that interests you. Although the course is admittedly biased towards the metropolitan realm, you may prefer to focus your research on agricultural or open space issues, or a specific land use issue linking to forest policy, conservation, endangered species, or watersheds, etc. Land use issues or conflicts in other cities or countries are also acceptable. However, you are expected to apply what we discuss in the seminars to your research.

Here are some guidelines and tips to consider when preparing your paper:

- Assume the reader of your paper (audience) is educated but not well-versed in your topic.
- Define a problem and/or solution as it relates to land use issues. Have a clear statement of purpose, and outline/ summarize what you will do in the paper in the introduction.
- Provide evidence of adequate background research & clear articulation of and understanding of that research. This means that you have referenced scholarly, peer reviewed articles, scholarly books, and legitimate reports by respected organizations. Do not rely on newspaper or other media, although they can be used. Do not rely on websites. Do not simply summarize articles. Relate them to your research, asks questions, and be critical of what you read for your research.

- Use appropriate methods to address problem, whether they be quantitative, qualitative, whether a literature review or empirical study. If your paper is more of a literature review for your thesis, then it should be thoroughly researched. If you are doing an empirical study or case study, some appropriate methods might include interviews, attendance of meetings, or statistical analysis and GIS.
- Clear reporting and articulation of ideas and key points.
- Conclusion that draws from results.
- Quality & clarity of thought
- Sources and citations that are clearly stated and consistent, with a complete bibliography formatted using commonly accepted practices in scholarly journals.
- Organization and development of paper that make sense.
- Grammar, spelling, usage, mechanics
- Do not rely on long block quotes or paraphrasing. Show your own work, in your own words

Academic Integrity

The university has established codes concerning proper academic conduct and the consequences resulting from improper behavior. Please be aware of these policies. The most important of which are academic misconduct. Please be aware of these codes as they are observed from this classroom to the California Code.

1) Students are responsible for knowing the SFSU regulations concerning cheating and plagiarism that are in the University bulletin.

2) Misconduct includes, but is not limited to, cheating on exams, fabrication of reports, assignments sources, etc. Plagiarism or the reproduction of others work without proper acknowledgment; interfering with another students work; or helping another student cheats.

Plagiarism is defined as copying another person's works without appropriate acknowledgement. This includes 1) quoting another persons' actual words. 2) Paraphrasing another person's words; 3) use of another persons' ideas, opinion or theory; or 4) borrowing of facts, statistics, or other illustrative material, unless information is common knowledge.

Class Schedule			
Geography 858			
Spring 2007 TTH - 7-9:45			
Date		Class Activity	Readings
30-Jan	Introduction	Review course objectives, themes, materials. Student introductions and division into reading groups.	Owen, D. (2004). Green Manhattan. The New Yorker: 111. Kunstler, J. H. (2005). The Long Emergency. Rolling Stone. Monbiot, G. (2005). Worse than Fossil Fuel. The Gaurdian Manchester, UK.
6-Feb	Planning in San Francisco	Discussion leader group A	San Francisco Planning Department (2002). Better Neighborhoods 2002: Market/Octavia Study Area, Draft for Public Review. San Francisco, San Francisco Planning Department: 205
13-Feb	History of environmental and land use planning in the United States	Discussion leader group B	Rome, A. (1998) "William Whyte, Open Space, and Environmental Activism," Geographical Review 88 (April 1998): 259-274. Rome, A. (2001). "Levitt's Progress: The Rise of the Suburban-Industrial Complex" (Ch 1) in The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press. Rome, A. (2001). Septic-tank Suburbia (Ch 3) in The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press. Rome, A. (2001). 'Toward a Land Ethic: The Quiet Revolution in Land-Use Regulation" (Ch. 7) in The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism. Whyte, W. (1958) Urban Sprawl. The Exploding Metropolis. The Editors of Fortune. Garden City, NY, Doubleday. Recommended: Fulton (2005) Part 1 (Chapters 1-3)
20-Feb	Sprawl and the environment	Discussion leader group C	Frumkin, Howard, Lawrence Frank, Richard Jackson (2004). Urban Sprawl and Public Health: Designing, Planning, and Building for Healthy Communities. Washington, DC, Island Press. Recommended: Fulton (2005) Part 1 (Chapters 1-3)
27-Feb	no class		

Date		Class Activity	Readings
6-Mar	Rebuilding New Orleans	New Orleans Discussion: Essay due at 7pm Paper proposal due at 7pm.	<p>Brookings (2005) New Orleans after the storm</p> <p>Campanella, T. (2005). Recovering New Orleans. Planetizen. Los Angeles.</p> <p>Colten, C. E. (2005). Chapters 1, 5, 6 in Unnatural Metropolis: Wrestling New Orleans from Nature.</p> <p>Davis & Fontenot. (2005). 25 questions about the murder of the big easy. San Francisco Chronicle.</p> <p>Garreau, J. (2005). A Sad Truth: Cities Aren't Forever Who, What, When, Where, Why? Washington Post.</p> <p>Henderson (2005). Thoughts on Rebuilding New Orleans. Planetizen. Los Angeles.</p> <p>Lewis, P. (2003). Chapters 1 & 4- 8 in New Orleans: The Making of an Urban Landscape.</p> <p>Mc Phee, J (2005) From "The Control of Nature: Atchafalaya," New Yorker February 23, 1987</p>
13-Mar	New Urbanism, smart growth, and TOD	Discussion leader group D	<p>Dittmar, Hank, and Gloria Ohland. (2004). The New Transit Town: Best Practices in Transit-Oriented Development. Washington, DC, Island Press.</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Part 4 (Chapters 14-18)</p>
20-Mar	Defense of Sprawl from the right	Discussion leader group E	<p>Bruegmann, R. (2005). Sprawl: A Compact History. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Chapters 1-3; 13</p>
27-Mar	Critiques of New Urbanism from the left	Discussion leader group A	<p>Harvey, D. (1997). The New Urbanism and the Communitarian Trap. Harvard Design Magazine. Winter/Spring: 68-69. http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/research/publications/hdm/back/1harvey.html</p> <p>Harvey, D. (2000). The Spaces of Utopia, Ch 8 in Spaces of Hope. University of California Press.</p> <p>McCann, E. (1995). Neotraditional Developments: The Anatomy of a New Urban Form. Urban Geography 16 (3): 210-233. **</p> <p>Lehrer, U. A. and R. Milgrom (1996). New (Sub)Urbanism: Countersprawl or Repackaging the Product. Capitalism, Nature, Socialism 7 (7): 49-64. **</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Part 4 (Chapters 14-18)</p>
3-Apr	Housing & Land use	Discussion leader group B	<p>Downs, A. (2002). Having housing prices risen faster in Portland than elsewhere? Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 7-31. http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/programs/hpd</p> <p>Nelson, A. (2002). Comment on Downs' "Have housing prices risen faster in Portland than elsewhere?". Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 33-42. http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/programs/hpd</p> <p>San Francisco Planning Department (2003) Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan, Part 2: Objectives, Policies, and Implementation Programs. San Francisco General Plan Housing Element Draft for Public Review. San Francisco, San Francisco Planning Department 84.</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Chapters 6 & 16</p>

10-Apr	Spring break		
--------	--------------	--	--

Date		Class Activity	Readings
17-Apr	Parking	Discussion leader group C	<p>Jia, W. and M. Wachs (1998) "Parking Requirement Impacts on Affordable Housing: A Case Study of San Francisco." TRB Paper(1999 meeting of TRB): 12.</p> <p>Litman, T. (2004). Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability. Victoria, BC, Victoria Transportation Policy Institute: 28.</p> <p>Shoup, D. (1997). "The High Cost of Free Parking." Journal of Planning Education and Research 17: 3-20.</p> <p>US EPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency) (2006). Parking Spaces/Community Places: Finding the Balance Through Smart Growth Solutions. Washington, DC, U EPA: 70.</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Chapters 10, 19, & 20</p>
24-Apr	The Politics of Mobility	Discussion leader group D	<p>Harvey, D. (1999). Social Justice, Postmodernism, and the City. Readings in Urban Theory. Malden, MA, Blackwell: 415-435.</p> <p>Henderson, J. (2004). "The Politics of Mobility and Business Elites in Atlanta, Georgia." Urban Geography 25(3): 193-216.</p> <p>Henderson, J. (2006). "Secessionist automobility: Racism, anti-urbanism, and the spatial politics of automobility in Atlanta, Georgia." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.</p> <p>Logan, J. R. and Harvey Molotch (1999). "The City as Growth Machine."</p> <p>Sheller, M. and John Urry (2000). "The City and the Car." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 24(4): 737-757.</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Chapters 4, 5</p>
1-May	EIR	Discussion leader group E	<p>San Francisco Planning Department (2005). Better Neighborhoods 2002: Market/Octavia Study Area, Environmental Impact Report, Draft for Public Review</p> <p>Olshansky, R. (1996). The California Environmental Quality Act and local planning. Journal of the American Planning Association 62 (3): 313 - 330.</p> <p>Landis, J., R. Pandell; et al. (1995). Fixing CEQA: Options and Opportunities for Reforming the California Environmental Quality Act. Berkeley, California Policy Research Center: http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/ceqa.html</p> <p>Recommended: Fulton (2005) Chapters 9 & Part 6 (Chapters 22-24)</p>
8-May	Final Presentations		
15-May	Final Presentations		
22-May	Final Presentations		