Sustainable cities and communities

Sustainable cities and communities refer to local governance strategies to achieve ecological, economic, and social sustainability in ways that are integrated and complementary, that is, without perverse tradeoffs between ecology and economy and in ways that enhance social goals of equity, diversity, community, and democracy.

This term began to be utilized tentatively in the U.S. during the 1980s by activists and professionals to help knit together urban civic and environmental innovations of previous decades. United Nations reports and projects lent further credence and the first ambitious handbook of best practices for North America appeared in 1992.

During the 1990s, civic and professional associations in multiple fields, as well as various offices in federal, state, and local agencies, developed a more robust framing of sustainable cities as including many interrelated components: watershed restoration, green building, smart growth, bicycle and pedestrian planning, new urbanism, healthy cities, and environmental justice (EJ). All have included new ways of engaging local publics and partnerships, and EJ has been particularly important in framing all these approaches in terms of engaging marginalized communities and ensuring equitable outcomes.

Other terminology has emerged to contest and refine sustainable cities, especially “resilient cities,” “just cities,” and “just sustainabilities.” Since cities face deep challenges rooted in historical land use patterns, racial segregation, environmental injustice, financialization, and other factors, progress on building sustainable, resilient, and just cities has been uneven and incomplete. Nonetheless, “sustainable cities” serves as a master frame for further action and policy.

History

Much civic action on the environment during the 1950s and 1960s had urban components, such as the struggles in many cities around clean water and clean air. However, the command-and-control design of major environmental laws in the 1970s did not include robust support for community- and place-based problem solving. Nonetheless, local action began to shift the terrain on various fronts, which tended over time to converge and to generate incentives for integrative thinking and action as “sustainable communities” and “sustainable cities.”

The Brundtland Commission’s report on sustainable development in 1987 lent further credence to the term, as have subsequent UN reports. It is now listed as Goal 11 of the U.N.’s Sustainable Development Goals.

Many American cities joined their counterparts around the globe in the U.N. project, now known as ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability, to share lessons and best practices. Cities have developed sustainability plans, sustainability offices, and sustainability directors, and have been assisted by ICLEI USA for the past three decades, and since 2009 also by the Urban Sustainability Directors Network, with the aid of many other collaborating associations, professions, and institutions.

City sustainability planning has increasingly included multiple components and has highlighted co-benefits across innovations. Especially important have been:

Watershed protection and restoration

While the emergence of a "watershed frame" in the 1980s has had broad scope across many types of landscapes, urban watersheds have been central. Thinking in terms of watersheds goes back to the late 19th century but only gained ecological and policy traction much later. Ecologists, conservation biologists and planners increasingly came to see hydrology, water quality, flood control, species protection, and land use as interrelated within large watersheds, such as the Chesapeake Bay watershed with its many cities, as well as within the many smaller watersheds nested within larger ones. Regulating pollutant-by-pollutant was inadequate, and command-and-control, as vital as it would remain, could not be fully successful without civic engagement and multi-stakeholder partnerships with the capacity to generate local knowledge and collaborative action.

This approach received sanction and support in the National Estuary Program (part of the Clean Water Act revisions of 1987), in the creation of the Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1991, in the adoption of state watershed policies, and in the formation of local watershed associations and councils around the country from the 1990s onwards. The latter often have also convened in statewide watershed assemblies and councils. The River Network and Restore America's Estuaries have been especially important in building civic capacity nationwide.

References:

CivicGreen Glossary: watershed association, provides an overview of the watershed field, with further references, organizations, case studies, and toolkits.

Paul A. Sabatier, Will Focht, Mark Lubell, Zev Trachtenberg, Arnold Vedlitz, and Marty Matlock, eds., *Swimming Upstream: Collaborative Approaches to Watershed Management* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).

Kim Herman Goslant, "Citizen Participation and Administrative Discretion in the Cleanup of Narragansett Bay," *Harvard Environmental Law Review* 12 (1988): 522-556.

Urban and community forestry

This field has roots going back many years in the U.S. and internationally, but began to cohere especially with the environmental movement, the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978, and the 1990 Farm Bill. The latter provided resources and established the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council to help develop the field. Objectives encompass everything from maintaining and improving water quality, habitat, and biodiversity, to improving public health and safety and capturing carbon.

The nonprofit Chicago Wilderness has provided one model based on forest restoration practices among volunteers enlisted in county forest preserves across the Chicago region from the late 1970s onwards. Today it includes several hundred member associations and institutions, including homeowner and park groups, local chapters of national associations (Audubon, Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy), cultural and educational organizations (Field Museum, Shedd Aquarium, Lincoln Park Zoo, university programs), and city, county, state, and federal forest, park, and other land use and natural resource agencies.

Another important model was developed with the Million Trees Campaign in New York City, part of Michael Bloomberg's PlaNYC, the mayor's broad sustainable city strategy beginning in 2007. The partnership of the City's department of parks and recreation and the nonprofit New York Restoration Partnership enlisted ordinary citizens, neighborhood and environmental associations, and other institutions (schools, universities, public housing authorities) in providing volunteers to plant on major tree planting days, as well stewards in their care thereafter.

The Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Program at the U.S. Forest Service has developed a panoply of toolkits for local civic and collaborative work based on sound science. Virtually all city sustainability and resilience plans now have an urban and community forestry component.

References:

CivicGreen Glossary: urban and community forestry, provides an overview of the urban and community forestry field, with further references, organizations, case studies, and toolkits.

CivicGreen Bookshelf: Lindsay K. Campbell, *City of Forests, City of Farms: Sustainability Planning for New York City's Nature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017). **Full review.**

CivicGreen Bookshelf: Dana R. Fisher, Erika S. Svendsen, and James Connolly, *Urban Environmental Stewardship and Civic Engagement: How Planting Trees Strengthens the Roots of Democracy* (New York: Routledge, 2015). **Full review.**

Paul Gobster and R. Bruce Hull, eds., *Restoring Nature: Perspectives from the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2000).

Environmental justice

Local community protests and several reports in the 1980s focused on environmental racism in the siting of hazardous waste facilities and other disproportionate burdens in communities of color. In 1991, the first environmental justice (EJ) summit developed core Principles of Environmental Justice for the movement. The EJ frame was adopted early in the Clinton administration (1993-2001), which created a National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) to help guide federal policy.

During the 1990s, EPA developed an office and an interagency working group to focus on EJ issues, and it also provided funding to local groups for hundreds of EJ projects, many of which were in cities. EJ organizing, in turn, began to challenge the broad field of sustainable cities to incorporate EJ critiques and concerns into virtually every area of policy and practice.

In the early 2000s, larger grant programs within EPA were developed for collaborative EJ projects that generated partnerships among local community and EJ groups and other stakeholders, such as public health agencies and healthcare providers, universities and public health schools, community and economic development corporations, union locals, and local businesses and chambers of commerce.

References:

CivicGreen Glossary: environmental justice, provides an overview of the environmental justice field, with further references, organizations, policies, case studies, toolkits, and debates.

CivicGreen Bookshelf: Michael Méndez, *Climate Change from the Streets: How Conflict and Collaboration Strengthen the Environmental Justice Movement* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2020). Full review.

CivicGreen Policy: "Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem Solving (EJCPS) and Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE): Two Models at EPA," Carmen Sirianni, July 2020, for an analysis of two grant programs that design for community engagement and collaboration.

Bicycle and pedestrian planning

The bicycle movement re-emerged in U.S. cities in the 1990s, supported by citywide bicycle associations in many cities. Contentious protests over bike lane and car space evolved into largely collaborative efforts as mayors and city agencies opened themselves up to genuine input by cycling groups, which were increasingly joined by pedestrian groups as well. The major national bicycle associations also supported this transition to co-productive and collaborative strategies.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA, 1991) and it successor laws have provided funding to local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian alternatives, as well as additional legal and administrative supports for public participation in transportation planning. In 1995, the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) formed to give greater voice to city (in contrast to state) transportation planners, and NACTO in turn has supported engagement among bicycle associations and in diverse neighborhood, senior, youth, library, and other local settings.

References:

CivicGreen Glossary: bicycle association, provides an overview, with further references, organizations, case studies, and toolkits.

Jeff Mapes, *Pedalling Revolution: How Cyclists Are Changing American Cities* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009).

Carlton Reid, *BIKE BOOM: The Unexpected Resurgence of Cycling* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2017).

Jason Henderson, *Street Fight: The Struggle over Urban Mobility in San Francisco* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013), chapter 5.

Healthy cities and communities

A movement for healthy cities and communities emerged in the U.S. and internationally in the 1980s, although innovations in community health existed previously. Framing includes the community as co-producer of relevant urban expertise and avoids the reductionism associated with single behaviors, diseases, and risk factors. It aims to incorporate the full complexity of social, spatial, economic, and environmental factors that interact to produce population health and illness, as well as the systemic inequalities that impede environmental and health justice.

Healthy community projects were diffused in the U.S. through the National Civic League, with modest funding from the Public Health Service (PHS) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in the late 1980s. Since then, various professional associations and public agencies, such as the American Public Health Association, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, have incorporated healthy cities and communities into their missions.

Effective democratic urban governance, including multi-stakeholder partnerships at the neighborhood level, is a key component of the healthy city frame.

References:

Jason Corburn, *Toward the Healthy City: People, Places, and the Politics of Urban Planning* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

Jason Corburn, *Street Science: Community Knowledge and Environmental Health Justice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).

Andrew L. Dannenberg, Howard Frumkin, and Richard J. Jackson, *Making Healthy Places: Designing and Building for Health, Well-Being, and Sustainability*, second edition (Washington: Island Press, 2011).

Green building

The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) lists as the first of its strategic goals to "catalyze and lead the building sector's active participation in the movement to achieve sustainable cities and communities."

USGBC was founded in 1993 by representatives of a dozen sectors of the building industry to promote building standards that reduce energy and water use, among other goals, which then became formalized in LEED (Leadership in Environment and Energy Design), a system of certification based upon a list of continually refined perquisites and credits. Environmental organizations also have served on its board.

In 2010, USGBC added LEED for Neighborhood Development, and more recently LEED for Cities and Communities, to promote design for entire neighborhoods and across a variety of sectors (housing and business building design and location, transportation, open space, ecological functions, green infrastructure, community gardens, food access), thus serving as a broad approach to neighborhood sustainability and environmentally sound land development.

USGBC has also recently added an ambitious campaign to link green building to social equity. "A sustainable future is meaningless without an equitable future."

The Poudre School District in Fort Collins, Colorado, developed an especially innovative "flat team" approach for relationship building that generated trust, respect, and mutual accountability across professional categories (architects, engineers, teachers) and blue and pink collar trades and staff (plumbers, custodians, HVAC, kitchen), as well as students, parents, school board, and other stakeholders in the community. The design, which has won many awards, also enhanced environmental and climate education in the district. The professionals who initiated this process operated as an especially reflective group of "democratic professionals."

References:

Rebecca L. Henn and Andrew J. Hoffman, eds., *Constructing Green: The Social Structures of Sustainability* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013).

Aaron Welch, Kaid Benfield, and Matt Raimi, *A Citizen's Guide to LEED for Neighborhood Development: How to Tell if Development is Smart and Green* (CNU, USGBC, and NRDC, n.d.)

USGBC, *USGBC All In: Building Equity Together* (November 2020).

CivicGreen Professionals: democratic professionals.

Framing and integrating

As this brief history suggests, framing and implementing sustainable city practices involves integrative work. Local actors, national associations, and public agencies articulate ways in which innovations in watershed restoration, healthy communities, bicycle planning, green building, and urban and community forests – all of which developed initially on separate tracks – can be viewed as complementary, thereby generating "co-benefits." Sustainable city toolkits and plans typically have chapters on each area, while also stressing interrelationships among them.

For instance, restoring estuaries encourages kayaking and thus enhances health benefits, as well as promoting tourist businesses and increasing oyster populations, which in turn provide for livelihoods and filter pollution. Urban and community forestry can reduce heat island effects, promote capture carbon, enhance flood control, enrich recreation opportunities, and augment property values. But bicycle lanes might privilege some neighborhoods and racial groups over others, as might urban forest projects, unless vigorous environmental justice framing and organizing compel attention to equity and diversity, as well as to more vigorous EJ policy tools and implementation.

Implementing sustainable city policies challenges urban bureaucracies that typically operate in silos to work across boundaries to achieve what some scholars call "functional collective action," and some cities are much better at this than others.

References:

Carmen Sirianni*, Sustainable Cities in American Democracy: From Postwar Urbanism to a Civic Green New Deal* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2020).

Rachel M. Krause and Christopher V. Hawkins, *Implementing City Sustainability: Overcoming Administrative Silos to Achieve Functional Collective Action* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2021).

Meg Holden, *Pragmatic Justifications for the Sustainable City: Acting in the Common Place* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

Peter Plastrik and John Cleveland, *Life After Carbon: The Next Global Transformation of Cities* (Washington: Island Press, 2018).

Michael R. Boswell, Adrienne I. Greve, and Tammy L. Seale. *Climate Action Planning: A Guide to Creating Low-Carbon, Resilient Communities*. Revised edition. (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2019).

Kent E. Portney, *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*, second edition (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

Steven Cohen, *The Sustainable City* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017).

Steven A. Moore, *Alternative Routes to the Sustainable City: Austin, Curitiba, and Frankfurt* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007).

Mark Roseland, *Toward Sustainable Communities: Solutions for Citizens and Their Governments.* Fourth edition (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 2012).

Capacity-building intermediaries

Sustainable city actors have developed networks for mutual support and learning over the past three decades. In some cases, they have joined global projects, such as those initiated by ICLEI. In other cases, they have organized more intensive peer-to-peer exchange, such as those of the Urban Sustainability Directors Network (USDN). In still others, they have relied upon the generalist urban associations that have developed sections on sustainability, such as the National League of Cities (NLC), the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), and the American Planning Association (APA).

Many city actors draw upon two or more of these organizations at some stage of their work, as well as upon specialist organizations in each relevant field. They also draw upon networks and programs initiated by offices at EPA and other agencies, or upon foundation-initiated networks, such as the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities (global, but now reconfigured as a separate nonprofit).

Several key intermediaries are the following:

ICLEI USA

ICLEI was founded as the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives at the 1990 U.N. Inaugural Congress of Local Governments for a Sustainable Future; ICLEI USA was established in 1995 as the regional office of ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability (its new name as of 2003).

While ICLEI USA draws upon deep technical knowledge in relevant fields and develops a range of toolkits and software for GHG emissions reduction, it remains committed to "community-based action," "participatory governance," and to "a participatory sustainable development planning process," which have been norms promoted by U.S. and European cities, as well as by city partners throughout the developing world. Terms such as "citizen-driven" and "co-creation," as well as "just," "equitable," "inclusive," and "diverse," are common in its publications and conferences.

References:

ICLEI USA, *Sustainability Planning Toolkit: A Comprehensive Guide for Local Governments on How to Create a Sustainability Plan* (New York: ICLEI and the City of New York Mayor's Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability, 2012).

ICLEI USA, with the Mayor's Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability, City of New York, *The Process Behind PlaNYC: How the City of New York Developed Its Long-Term Comprehensive Sustainability Plan* (April 2010).

ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, *The ICLEI Montreal Commitment and Strategic Vision 2018-2024:* Building a Sustainable Urban World (Bonn, Germany: 2018).

USDN

The Urban Sustainability Directors Network (USDN) was founded in 2009 by several practitioners key to Chicago's first Climate Action Plan, as well as to Seattle's sustainability planning, along with an emerging network of city sustainability directors across the country. While recognizing the key role of ICLEI in capacity building, USDN practitioners have sought more intensive peer learning processes.

As of 2018, USDN facilitated ten regional partner networks among its 200 or so member cities (including a network in Canada), comprised of core members as well as their local affiliates who may choose not to join USDN, at least initially. Among these regional partner networks are the New England Municipal Sustainability Network, Green Cities California, the Great Lakes Climate Adaptation Network, and the Southeast Sustainability Directors Network.

USDN's Urban Sustainability Bulletin provides regular updates on cities and projects across the U.S.

References:

Sadhu Aufochs Johnston, Steven S. Nicholas, and Julia Parzen, *The Guide to Greening Cities* (Washington: Island Press, 2013).

USDN, with Institute for Sustainable Communities and Nutter Consulting, *Getting Smart about Smart Cities: USDN Resource Guide* (2014).

Case studies

Many cities in the U.S. have developed trajectories towards sustainability and resilience, although some have been more robust than others and all face significant barriers. Civic engagement has been key at multiple points along the way, depending on the city, with some engaged in prolonged battles to secure a voice for neighborhood and environmental groups in urban governance and others gaining early representation in planning and partnerships with city agencies.

Some cities whose sustainability pathways have been notable are the following:

San Francisco

Neighborhood and environmental groups leveraged struggles against highways and downtown development from the 1950s onwards, but only gained a significant voice in planning in the late 1980s. Sustainability strategies emerged in the 1990s, with relatively robust civic action around bicycles, open space, the SF Bay estuary, and parks, and later with healthy community coalitions, food justice networks, and youth and many other forms of engagement.

References:

CivicGreen City Desk: San Francisco, for timelines, organizations, references.

Richard A. Walker, *The Country in the City: The Greening of the San Francisco Bay Area* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007).

Jason Corburn, *Toward the Healthy City: People, Places, and the Politics of Urban Planning* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

Sally Fairfax, Louise Nelson Dyble, Greig Tor Guthey, Lauren Gwin, Monica Moore, and Jennifer Sokolove, *California Cuisine and Just Food* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Hal K. Rothman, *The New Urban Park: Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Civic Environmentalism* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

Portland

The neighborhood movement was especially strong and was institutionalized early in the 1970s in a citywide system of neighborhood associations with capacity to shape growth. In addition, Oregon's state growth management act led to robust regional land-use planning, with extensive public participation in shaping the urban growth boundary around Portland. Bicycle, watershed, and open space movements developed further in the 1990s, and the city was among the first to join ICLEI, as well as engaging early in sustainability planning; it developed the first climate action plan in the U.S. in 1993. In 2020, the city declared a "climate emergency."

Portland State University has also been notable in promoting community-based learning and university-community partnerships, many of which are aimed at enhancing sustainability in the city.

References:

CivicGreen City Desk: Portland, for timelines, organizations, references.

History and key documents of climate planning and action in Portland.

Connie P. Ozawa, ed., *The Portland Edge: Challenges and Successes in Growing Communities* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2004).

Sy Adler, *Oregon Plans: The Making of an Unquiet Land Use Revolution* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2012).

Matthew Slavin and Kent Snyder, "Strategic Climate Action Planning in Portland," in Matthew Slavin, ed., *Sustainability in America's Cities: Creating the Green Metropolis*, second edition (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2011), 21-44.

Judith Layzer, "Making Tradeoffs: Urban Sprawl and the Evolving System of Growth Management in Portland, Oregon," in Judith A. Layzer and Sara R. Rinfret, eds, *The Environmental Case: Translating Values into Policy,* fifth edition (Washington: CQ Press, 2020), 499-528.

Chicago

Conflicts over urban transformation in the postwar period were especially intense in Chicago and the opening to neighborhood and African American empowerment under Mayor Harold Washington in the 1980s was cut short by his untimely death. Nonetheless, the city developed a range of sustainability initiatives under the long tenure of Mayor Richard M. Daley (1989-2011). His 2008 climate action plan leveraged the work of various environmental justice, urban forest, bicycle, brownfield restoration, and similar groups.

References:

CivicGreen City Desk: Chicago, see for timelines, organizations, references.

City of Chicago, *Sustainable Chicago 2015: Action Agenda and Updates* (2012-2015).

Julia Parzen, *Lessons Learned: Creating the Chicago Climate Action Plan* (Chicago: Global Philanthropy Partnership, ICLEI USA, and the City of Chicago, 2009).

Seattle

The city has a long history of neighborhood engagement, "ecotopian" movement culture, and Native American stewardship of salmon, fisheries, and the Puget Sound. The 1994 comprehensive plan, *Toward a Sustainable Seattle,* leveraged this legacy further and enabled a robust system of neighborhood planning. Community gardening, green building, and

climate action planning have been robust, as have been local participation and collaboration in the region's National Estuary Program, the Puget Sound Partnership.

References:

CivicGreen City Desk: Seattle, see for timelines, references, organizations, planning templates, institutional designs.

Jim Diers, *Neighbor Power: Building Community the Seattle Way* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004).

Carmen Sirianni, *Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance* (Washington, DC: Brookings Press, 2009), chapter 3.

Jeffrey Hou, Julie M. Johnson, and Laura J. Lawson, *Greening Cities, Growing Communities* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009).

Urban governance

Building sustainable, resilient, and just cities in the United States must leverage power, participation, and policy at many scales, from neighborhood to nation and beyond. Engaging communities and enabling institutional partnerships occurs amidst powerful dynamics of growth and stagnation, regional and global capital flows, and political coalitions at local, state, and federal levels. Inequalities are embedded deeply into institutional systems and racial injustice is inscribed in historical patterns going back decades and centuries. Climate threats and ecological vulnerabilities extend as far as the eye can see. Democratic values and institutions are more fragile than we once imagined possible.

Nonetheless, sustainable cities constitute a project that can leverage civic engagement, political power, economic opportunity, and institutional innovation to help anchor and complement broader strategies for climate mitigation and resilience, as well as for racial and social justice. No overarching theoretical perspective offers a clear and singular path forward, yet some ground action in a range of analytic insights that can yield genuine advances. The barriers, as outlined in the final section, are substantial, yet need not impede pragmatic and sustained innovation.

Among those factors that can enable further innovation are the following:

- *urban regime and governance dynamics:* much scholarship stresses opportunities for relational work across civic, business, professional, union, bureaucratic, and nonprofit organizations that enables the social production of "power to" get things done and hence to "produce" public and private benefits, rather than simply to distribute them. The framing of sustainable, resilient, and just cities provides many areas for co-productive and collaborative work in this vein, and for nurturing the capacity of some mix of civic associations to find appropriate ways of translating indispensable contestation into fruitful collaboration. Cities are not locked in by traditional growth machine dynamics or neoliberal logics.

- *place-dependent logics:* cities can often leverage place-dependent value and agglomeration logics, as well as participatory subcultures, to challenge economic inequality and to tie urban livability to sustainability. Cities *can* govern, even in an era of mobile, global capital, despite some constitutional limits by state and federal governments, as well as the national electoral disadvantages inscribed by economic and political geography. We do certainly need new urban policies at the national level. But cities can govern much more sustainably, equitably, and democratically if we enable them.

- *leverage public assets:* while cities face many fiscal constraints, they also have vast assets, especially land, that they can inventory much more fully and then leverage for large public purposes, such as sustainable and resilient infrastructure and equitable opportunity.

References:

Marion Orr and Valerie C. Johnson, eds., *Power in the City: Clarence Stone and the Politics of Inequality* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008).

Clarence N. Stone and Robert P. Stoker, with others, *Urban Neighborhoods in a New Era: Revitalization Politics in the Post-Industrial City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

Susan S. Fainstein, *The Just City* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010).

Richard Schragger, *City Power: Urban Governance in a Global Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Bruce Katz and Jeremy Nowak, *The New Localism: How Cities Can Thrive in the Age of Populism* (Washington: Brookings Press, 2017).

Dag Detter and Stefan Fölster, *The Public Wealth of Cities: How to Unlock Hidden Assets to Boost Growth and Prosperity* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2017).

Jonathan S. Davies and Jessica Trounstine, "Urban Politics and the New Institutionalism," in Karen Mossberger, Susan E. Clarke, and Peter John, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 51-70.

Limits and critiques

While strategies for sustainable and resilient cities have yielded much progress over the past several decades and represent a foundation upon which to build in the years ahead, they have proven limited and constrained. It will take a far more robust mix of civic and environmental justice organizing, multi-stakeholder collaboration, effective planning, and other strategies for racial and social justice, labor empowerment, and sustainable business to leverage this progress

to generate further pathways and across many more cities. Policy at state and federal levels will be critically important, as will progress among cities globally.

Sustainable, resilient, and just cities present a plausible and pragmatic framework for further progress over the coming decades. Nonetheless, the limits and critiques outlined below must be addressed effectively. However, when they are paired with romantic paeans to "rebel cities," unspecified forms of "true democracy," or sweeping post-capitalist and post-market economic transformation – as they sometimes are – these critiques diminish their capacity to inform democratic action and institutional reform.

Some important limits to address are:

- *participatory biases:* while systems of neighborhood and sustainability planning are often designed to be participatory, biases in actual engagement can be skewed to more educated, professional, home-owning, and white residents, especially absent strong norms, trust, outreach, and formal accountability for diversity and inclusion.

- *gentrification:* new urbanist and smart growth designs, river restoration, bikeways and greenways, and other reforms can increase real estate values and property taxes and thus disperse low and moderate income groups, as well as some of the businesses that employ them, from the central city and other historically Black and Latino neighborhoods.

- *financialization:* as cities come to depend increasingly on financial instruments and real-estate field actors that promote constant building and speculative excess, they foster boom-bubble-bust cycles that can lead to overbuilding, consume vast energy and material resources, and produce construction and demolition debris often dumped in landfills in minority and low-income areas.

- *crisis-driven urbanization:* as the devastation from hurricanes, floods, and other climate-related disasters increases, political and economic incentives tend to favor rapid post-disaster recovery and rebuilding at the expense of low-income residents, small businesses, and poor neighborhoods. Increasingly "concatenated crises" place a premium on far more robust and socially just forms of civic engagement and collaborative planning for cities and regions in the decades ahead.

References:

Rachel Weber, *From Boom to Bubble: How Finance Built the New Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), whose concluding chapter ("The Slow Build") includes important regulatory strategies.

Kevin Fox Gotham and Miriam Greenberg, *Crisis Cities: Disaster and Redevelopment in New York and New Orleans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Andrew M. Busch, *City in a Garden: Environmental Transformations and Racial Justice in Twentieth-Century Austin, Texas* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

Andrew Ross, *Bird on Fire: Lessons from the World's Least Sustainable City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Julian Agyeman, *Introducing Just Sustainabilities: Policy, Planning, and Practice* (London: Zed Books, 2013).

Kenneth A. Gould and Tammy L. Lewis, *Green Gentrification: Urban Sustainability and the Struggle for Environmental Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

Winifred Curran and Trina Hamilton, eds., *Just Green Enough: Urban Development and Environmental Gentrification* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

Richard Florida, *The New Urban Crisis: How Our Cities are Increasing Inequality, Deepening Segregation, and Failing the Middle Class – and What We Can Do About It* (New York: Basic Books, 2017).

Jessica Trounstine, *Segregation by Design: Local Politics and Inequality in American Cities* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

We welcome suggestions and comments to help improve this entry: civicgreen@tufts.edu

Last revised: 11/20/20