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## 1NC – Module

#### No sprawl now—expert consensus and census figures

Karlenzig ’12 (Warren, April 10, president of Common Current, a global consultancy for urban sustainability planning, fellow of the Post Carbon Institute, Sustainable Cities Collective, “Census and Experts Confirm Death of Sprawl in US”, <http://sustainablecitiescollective.com/commoncurrent/38937/census-and-experts-confirm-death-sprawl-us> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

The United States has reached an historic moment. The exurban development explosion that defined national growth during the past two decades has come to a screeching halt, according to the latest US Census figures. Only 1 of the 100 highest-growth US communities of 2006—all of them in sprawled areas—reported a significant population gain in 2011, prompting Yale economist Robert Shiller to predict suburbs overall may not see growth “during our lifetimes.” We are simultaneously witnessing the decline of the economic sectors enabled by hypergrowth development: strip malls and massive shopping centers, SUVs and McMansions. The end of exurban population growth has been accompanied by steep economic decline in real estate value, triggering a loss of spending not only in construction, but also home improvement (Home Depot, Best Buy) and numerous associated retail sectors that were banking on the long-term rising fortunes of “Boomburbs.” The fate of these communities has been so dire that for the first time in the United States suburbs now have greater poverty than cities. In 2009, I attributed the financial crash in these car-based communities to economic factors perpetrated by the higher gas prices that had first started showing impacts in late 2006 and peaked in 2008. Others including The Brookings Institution’s Christopher Leinberger, and William Frey, along with NRDC’s Kaid Benfield have pointed to longer term demographic shifts and societal desires toward renting in denser mixed-use neighborhoods. The looming specter of excess greenhouse gases may also be playing a role in the marked reduction of driving among younger Americans (16-39 year olds), who increasingly prefer to live where they can walk or bike to their local store, school or café. The “Death of Sprawl” chapter I wrote that was published by the Post Carbon Institute in 2009 (and in abridged form in the Post Carbon Reader in 2010) provided a case study on Victorville, California. Located 75 miles outside Los Angeles, Victorville’s rise and crash epitomized the hangover of the go-go sprawl era. During the financial system’s Derivative Daze, Victorville grew from 64,000 in 2000 to more than 108,000 by 2005: no-money-down-housing developments and “liar loans” fueled speculative investments that pumped up the desert city’s average home value to almost $350,000. The large numbers of workers that moved to Victorville had to commute long hours before dawn and after dark to get to work in Los Angeles, without the benefit of local public transit. There are still few options for those who wish to walk or bicycle to stores, jobs, schools or local amenities, and the average near 100 degree summer temperatures make such endeavors foolhardy. When gas prices began to go up in 2006, real estate sales in the region began to dry up as people ran for the exits. As the doors slammed shut, foreclosures in California’s Inland Empire (Victorville and other parts of California’s sprawling San Bernardino and Riverside counties), Las Vegas and Florida began to trigger a nationwide real estate meltdown. To stick with our illustration, Victorville houses plummeted from an average of nearly $350,000 in 2006 to $125,000 by late 2009. Likewise, new home permits in Victorville went from 7964 in 2004-06 down to 739 in 2008-10: a drop of more than tenfold! The average home sale now brings around $110,000, less than a third of 2005-2006 prices. Institutional investors and homebuyers alike have avoided for the past five years the nation’s scores of Victorvilles; the new data and pronouncements by experts such as Shiller, author of The S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Index, likely put the last nails in the coffin of speculative, auto-dependant sprawl.

#### **New modes of transportation contribute to urban sprawl**

Rog, 2010, Morgan E. Rog, J.D./M.P.H Candidate at Georgetown University Law Center and Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, Georgetown International Environmental Law Review, “Highway to the Danger Zone: Urban Sprawl, Land Use, and the Environment”

While urban sprawl was the result of many factors, the effects of the advent and popularity of the automobile on American city planning were crucial. Although their environmental impacts are often discussed in terms of carbon emissions, the lifestyle they have made possible in this country represents the most serious environmental hazard posed by cars. n44 As discussed previously, the car was popularized in the United States as a tool to combat urbanism. This was one reason why Henry Ford, responding to the numerous issues associated with population density in cities at the time, determined to ensure the automobile's success. n45 Thus, automobiles and zoning, both of which reached the height of popularity when the United States had a blatant disgust for city life, have developed a symbiotic relationship--the unrestrained mobility of an automobile fueled the desire to separate one's home from everything else with as much distance as possible, aggravating the phenomenon of urban sprawl. n46 As a quintessential part of American culture, the automobile has done much to aggravate the trend towards urban sprawl. Presently, becoming "eco-friendly" has become fashionable, leading to the rise in popularity of hybrid vehicles. While these cars are certainly more energy efficient than automobiles that run exclusively on gasoline, this trend may actually be counter-productive. n47 As [\*713] vehicles become more fuel efficient, like the many. popular hybrid models available on the market currently, vehicle travel becomes less expensive. This has the unfortunate effect of actually encouraging more vehicle travel. n48 Naturally, suburban expansion would not have been possible without the creation of an expansive network of streets and highways. This transportation infrastructure also plays an important role in the sprawl story. As urban sprawl increased, so did the necessity to drive longer and longer distances to work. Although commute times have remained relatively constant over the years, efficiency has increased, indicating that as people's drive to work takes less time, they are working further and further away from their homes. n49 This is in keeping with Down's Law, which provides that as transportation capacity increases, demand expands to fill that capacity. n50 Numerous behavioral changes also take place in response to changes in transportation infrastructure. n51 These include triple convergence, induced travel, and induced development, all of which contribute to sprawl and the issues associated with it. n52 Triple convergence is a term used to refer to three ways in which travelers respond to a new transportation facility--they can change the time that they travel, their travel mode, or their travel route. n53 Induced travel comprises travelers' response to changes in transportation capacity--typically as the cost of travel in terms of time decreases, people tend to take advantage of the increased efficiency, and travel more frequently and for longer distances. n54 Finally, induced development occurs when significant transportation capacity increases result in long-term changes to land use patterns, which ultimately reflect shifts in the duration or origin of trips. n55

#### Urban sprawl drastically increases global warming – entire system, not just cars, dependant on fossil fuels

Gonzalez ’05 (George, assistant professor of U.S. public policy at University of Miami, Environmental Policy 14(3), “Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Limits of Ecological Modernisation”, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0964410500087558> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

Especially since the Second World War, sprawling urban communities have been an important source of growth in global economic demand – pushing up consumption of such commodities as land, gasoline, electricity, automobiles and household appliances (Olney 1991; Frumkin 2004). While increasing eﬀective global demand, urban sprawl has had the unintended consequence of signiﬁcantly contributing to global climate change. This is because urban sprawl is predicated on large, inexpensive inputs of energy drawn from fossil fuels. Without such large and relatively cheap inputs, urban sprawl to the extent that it has occurred is seemingly unfeasible.

#### Extinction

Tickell 8 (Oliver Tickell, Environmental Researcher, 2008, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson [PhD in Chemistry, Award for Scientific Freedom and Responsibility from the American Association for the Advacement of Science] told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global **warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean**, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our **extinction**. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King [Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment at the University of Oxford], who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that **this historical event may be analogous to the present**: **the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth**.

## Uniqueness

#### No sprawl now—too costly, stats prove

El Nasser & Overburg ’12 (Haya and Paul, April 5, El Nasser: demographics reporter at USA Today, Overburg: database editor at USA Today, USA Today, “America’s romance with sprawl may be over”, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/story/2012-04-05/sprawl-census-urban/54007292/1> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

Almost three years after the official end of a recession that kept people from moving and devastated new suburban subdivisions, people continue to avoid counties on the farthest edge of metropolitan areas, according to Census estimates out today. The financial and foreclosure crisis forced more people to rent. Soaring gas prices made long commutes less appealing. And high unemployment drew more people to big job centers. As the nation crawls out of the downturn, cities and older suburbs are leading the way. Population growth in fringe counties nearly screeched to a halt in the year that ended July 1, 2011. By comparison, counties at the core of metro areas are growing faster than the nation as a whole. "There's a pall being cast on the outer edges," says John McIlwain, senior fellow for housing at the Urban Land Institute, a non-profit development group that promotes sustainability. "The foreclosures, the vacancies, the uncompleted roads. It's uncomfortable out there. The glitz is off." A USA TODAY analysis shows: • All but two of the 39 counties with 1 million-plus people — Michigan's Wayne (Detroit) and Ohio's Cuyahoga (Cleveland) — grew from 2010 to 2011. • Twenty-eight of the big counties gained faster than the nation, which grew at the slowest rate since the Great Depression (0.73%). The counties' median growth rate was 1.3% (half grew faster, half slower). Those 28 — including California's Alameda and Contra Costa counties, Florida's Broward and Hillsborough, Texas' Harris and Dallas — generated more than a third of the USA's growth. Before the recession and housing bust, when people flocked to new development on farmland, they contributed just 27%. "It shows the locational advantage of being in the biggest cities," says Robert Lang, professor of urban affairs at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and author of Megapolitan America. "The core is what's left of our competitiveness as a country." •Central metro counties accounted for 94% of U.S. growth, compared with 85% just before the recession. "This could be the end of the exurb as a place where people aspire to go when they're starting their families," says William Frey, demographer at the Brookings Institution. "So many people have been burned by this. … First-time home buyers, immigrants and minorities took a real big hit."

#### Sprawl slowing—census proves

Mosemak et al. ’12 (Jerry, Chad Palmer, Haya El Nasser, Paul Overburg, April 5, Mosemak: art director at USA Today, Palmer: senior design developer at USA Today, El Nasser: demographics reporter at USA Today, Overburg: database editor at USA Today, USA Today, “U.S. population growth slows, especially in far suburbs”, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/story/2012-04-05/sprawl-census-urban/54007292/1> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

Five years ago, millions of Americans were streaming to new homes on the fringes of metropolitan areas. Then housing prices collapsed and the Great Recession slowed growth to levels not seen since the Great Depression in the 1930s. Growth remained slow last year, and largely confined to counties at the center of metropolitan areas. Maps show population gain or loss in 2006 and 2011, based on new Census Bureau estimates.

#### No sprawl now—previous economic enticement is gone

McIlwain ’12 (John, April 5, senior resident fellow and chair for housing at the Urban Land Institute, JD from New York University, Urbanland, “The Great Recession: A Slayer of Sprawl”, <http://urbanland.uli.org/Articles/2012/April/McIlwainSprawl> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

Finally, and by no means the least of the reasons to anticipate that the current decline in outer-ring growth is the start of a long-term trend, is that the bloom is off the rose. Whether the concern is the price of gasoline, the loss of time to commuting, or the bleakness of living surrounded by foreclosed homes and vacant lots, the glitz is gone from outer-ring suburbs. The only people buying in the outer-rings today are those attracted by their rock-bottom prices. Sadly, they will discover that what they thought were savings will be eaten up by the higher cost of living on the outer edges with no nearby jobs, stores or services. And, when the time comes to sell their homes, these owners will find that there has been little appreciation and that they have made penny-wise and pound-foolish choices. Disasters and tough times seem to accelerate existing trends, and the recession and housing crash are no exceptions. The shift to more urban housing development has been growing slowly during the past couple of decades and thanks to the recession and housing crash, this trend has accelerated. It is probable that the trends that the USA Today analysis points to are the precursors to a long-term shift in suburban development resulting in more in-fill, close-in development and far less growth on the outer edges of metropolitan areas. It is increasingly clear that just as the past century was the century of suburbanization, this is the century of urbanization for the United States.

#### Sprawl slowing—generational gap incentivizes city living

Kalita & Whelan ’11 (Mitra and Robbie, January 13, Kalita: global economics editor at the Wall Street Journal, Whelan: reporter at the Wall Street Journal, bachelors of history from Johns Hopkins University, “No McMansions for Millennials”, <http://blogs.wsj.com/developments/2011/01/13/no-mcmansions-for-millennials/> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

Here’s what Generation Y doesn’t want: formal living rooms, soaker bathtubs, dependence on a car. In other words, they don’t want their parents’ homes. Much of this week’s National Association of Home Builders conference has dwelled on the housing needs of an aging baby boomer population. But their children actually represent an even larger demographic. An estimated 80 million people comprise the category known as “Gen Y,” youth born roughly between 1980 and the early 2000s. The boomers, meanwhile, boast 76 million. Gen Y housing preferences are the subject of at least two panels at this week’s convention. A key finding: They want to walk everywhere. Surveys show that 13% carpool to work, while 7% walk, said Melina Duggal, a principal with Orlando-based real estate adviser RCLCO. A whopping 88% want to be in an urban setting, but since cities themselves can be so expensive, places with shopping, dining and transit such as Bethesda and Arlington in the Washington suburbs will do just fine. “One-third are willing to pay for the ability to walk,” Ms. Duggal said. “They don’t want to be in a cookie-cutter type of development. …The suburbs will need to evolve to be attractive to Gen Y.” Outdoor space is important—but please, just a place to put the grill and have some friends over. Lawn-mowing not desired. Amenities such as fitness centers, game rooms and party rooms are important (“Is the room big enough to host a baby shower?” a millennial might think). “Outdoor fire pits,” suggested Tony Weremeichik of Canin Associates, an architecture firm in Orlando. “Consider designing outdoor spaces as if they were living rooms.” Smaller rooms and fewer cavernous hallways to get everywhere, a bigger shower stall and skip the tub, he said. Oh, but don’t forget space in front of the television for the Wii, and space to eat meals while glued to the tube, because dinner parties and families gathered around the table are so last-Gen. And maybe a little nook in the laundry room for Rover’s bed? In his presentation, KTGY Group residential designer David Senden showed slide after slide of dwellings that looked like a cross between a hotel lobby and the set of “Melrose Place.” He christened the subset of the generation delaying marriage and family as “dawdlers.” “A house in the suburbs is not for them,” Mr. Senden said. “At least not yet.” Places to congregate are more important than a big apartment, he cautioned. He showed one layout of a studio apartment—350 square feet, as big as Mom and Dad’s Great Room. Common space has migrated to “club rooms,” he said, where Gen-Y residents can host meals and hang out before heading to a common movie-screening room or rooftop swimming pool that they share with the building’s other tenants. The Great Recession and its effects on young people’s wages will affect how much home they can buy or rent for years to come.

#### Sprawl slowing—lasting economic issues

Goodman ’08 (Peter, June 25, executive business editor of the Huffington Post, masters in Asian studies from University of California-Berkeley, former writer for the New York Times, “Fuel Prices Shift Math for Life in Far Suburbs”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/25/business/25exurbs.html?_r=3&hp&oref=slogin> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

But life on the edges of suburbia is beginning to feel untenable. Mr. Boyle and his wife must drive nearly an hour to their jobs in the high-tech corridor of southern Denver. With gasoline at more than $4 a gallon, Mr. Boyle recently paid $121 to fill his pickup truck with diesel fuel. In March, the last time he filled his propane tank to heat his spacious house, he paid $566, more than twice the price of 5 years ago. Though Mr. Boyle finds city life unappealing, it is now up for reconsideration. “Living closer in, in a smaller space, where you don’t have that commute,” he said. “It’s definitely something we talk about. Before it was ‘we spend too much time driving.’ Now, it’s ‘we spend too much time and money driving.’ ” Across the nation, the realization is taking hold that rising energy prices are less a momentary blip than a change with lasting consequences. The shift to costlier fuel is threatening to slow the decades-old migration away from cities, while exacerbating the housing downturn by diminishing the appeal of larger homes set far from urban jobs. In Atlanta, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Minneapolis, homes beyond the urban core have been falling in value faster than those within, according to an analysis by Moody’s Economy.com. In Denver, housing prices in the urban core rose steadily from 2003 until late last year compared with previous years, before dipping nearly 5 percent in the last three months of last year, according to Economy.com. But house prices in the suburbs began falling earlier, in the middle of 2006, and then accelerated, dropping by 7 percent during the last three months of the year from a year earlier. Many factors have propelled the unraveling of American real estate, from the mortgage crisis to a staggering excess of home construction, making it hard to pinpoint the impact of any single force. But economists and real estate agents are growing convinced that the rising cost of energy is now a primary factor pushing home prices down in the suburbs, particularly in the outer rings. More than three-fourths of prospective home buyers are now more inclined to live in an urban area because of fuel prices, according to a recent survey of 903 real estate agents with Coldwell Banker, the national brokerage firm.

#### U.N. report shows people moving to cities

Times of India ’08 (The Times of India: World, February 28, India’s largest daily English newspaper, “Urban sprawl: Half the world headed for cities”, <http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2008-02-28/us/27775459_1_rural-areas-urban-areas-urban-sprawl> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

UNITED NATIONS: Half of the global population will live in cities by the end of this year for the first time in human history while the percentage of urbanised in India will only be 29%, latest projections by the United Nations show. The report predicts that the number of people living in urban areas would rise to 70% by 2050. Currently, 3.3 billion people of estimated population of 6.4 billion are living in urban areas and their number would double to 6.4 billion by 2050 when some 9.2 billion people are expected to inhabit the Earth, the report said.

## UQ -- Brink

#### Lasting decrease in sprawl now—but transportation must remain expensive

Peñalver ’07 (Eduardo, December 30, associate professor of property law at Cornell University Law School, “The End of Sprawl?”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/28/AR2007122802449.html> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

American sprawl was built on the twin pillars of low gas prices and a relentless demand for housing that, combined with the effects of restrictive zoning in existing suburbs, pushed new development outward toward cheap rural land. Middle-class Americans, not able to find housing they could afford in existing suburbs, kept driving farther out into the countryside until they did. Gridlock in the suburbs and the expense of providing municipal services to sparsely populated communities imposed their own limits on how far we could spread. As a result, the density of metropolitan areas, which fell steadily in the postwar years, had begun to creep back up in the 1990s. Despite these infrastructural restraints, however, the now-defunct housing boom and cheap gas kept exerting centrifugal pressure on living patterns, pushing the edge of new development farther out into rural America. Over the past year or so, both of these forces have dramatically weakened. With credit tight and the demand for housing drying up (sales of new homes fell last month to the lowest level in 12 years) new construction in the exurbs is grinding to a halt. The result is a decline in the building industry's appetite for rural land on the urban edge. The question now is whether that decline will last. In the past, a sudden drop-off in demand for housing in the exurbs would have represented merely a hiatus. Builders would have bided their time until the housing market recovered, and the outward push would soon have begun again. But persistently high gas prices may mean that the next building boom will take place not at the edges of metropolitan areas but far closer to their cores. People are more willing to drive 20 miles each way to work every day, burning a couple of gallons of gas in the process, when gas costs less than milk. But as gas prices climb, long car commutes become a rising tax on exurban homeownership, and the price people are willing to pay for homes in remote areas will fall.

#### Sprawl ending—gas prices discourage it, and young people prefer cities

Yen ’12 (Hope, April 5, reporter for the Associated Press, JD from Harvard Law School, “Sprawling Suburbs Growth Falls To Historic Low Amid High Gas Prices”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/05/sprawling-suburbs_n_1405221.html> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

All across the U.S., residential exurbs that sprouted on the edge of metropolitan areas are seeing their growth fizzle, according to new 2011 census estimates released Thursday. Gas prices are discouraging long commutes. Young singles prefer city apartments. Two years after the recession technically ended, and despite some signs of economic recovery, there's a reversal of urbanites' decades-long exodus to roomy homes in distant towns. Indeed, Americans are shunning any moves at all – the lowest rate in records going back to the 1940s. The annual rate of growth in American cities and surrounding urban areas has now surpassed that of exurbs for the first time in at least 20 years, spanning the most recent era of sprawling suburban development.

#### No sprawl now—gas prices make it undesirable

Darden ’12 (Autumnn, April 24, lead market analyst at ABF U-Pack Moving, “Cost of moving: Gas prices kill exurban expansion”, <http://www.upack.com/press/article/cost-of-moving/cost-of-moving-gas-prices-kill-exurban-expansion-800748955/> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

As suburban expansion continued, it gave rise to the "exurb," an area even further on the edge of a metropolitan area. But comparatively low-cost housing and proximity to other, more populated areas kept the exurbs growing - until recently. Fewer Americans have been moving to these locations in recent years, and there's one big reason why: gas prices. Some areas of the country that once saw boom times are now going bust as rising gas prices make the cost of commuting almost too much to bear. Kendall County, Illinois, was the fastest growing area of the country between 2000 and 2010, with the population more than doubling over that time, according to an Associated Press analysis of recent U.S. Census Bureau data. Toward the end of the decade, however, the story changed. With roughly 50 miles between Kendall County and Chicago and gas prices rising, fewer people saw the area as an attractive option. Population growth slowed to 1 percent by 2011. The trend is much the same in the rest of the country, where average exurban growth hovers at 0.9 percent. As of early April 2012, the national average price for a gallon of regular gasoline was $3.92, according to AAA. The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute recently announced the average U.S. automobile gets 23.7 miles to the gallon. With a 100-mile round trip from Kendall County to Chicago, the average commuter would spend $16.54 per day on gasoline. That's roughly $82 per week, $370 per month, or $4,300 per year. "The heyday of exurbs may well be behind us," Yale University economist Robert Shiller told AP. "With the bursting of the [housing] bubble, we may be discovering the pleasures of the city and the advantages of renting, investing our money not in a single house but in a diversified portfolio."

#### No sprawl now—transportation specific

Lindsay ’10 (Greg, May 21, only person to defeat IBM’s Watson in a game of Jeopardy, writer for Fast Company, visiting scholar at New York University’s Rudin Center for Transportation Policy & Management, “HUD Announces the End of Urban Sprawl as We Know It, New Urbanists Feel Fine”, <http://www.fastcompany.com/1650533/the-end-of-sprawl-obama-administration-to-take-new-urbanism-mainstream> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

The implications go beyond funding for public housing. Last year, HUD joined the Department of Transportation and the Environmental Protection Agency in creating the Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities, an effort to think holistically about housing, transportation, and quality of life when awarding tens of billions of dollars in federal funds. It is an article of faith among advocates for sustainable development that the notion Americans want sprawl is a pernicious myth. Sprawl isn't a function of market forces but the outcome of federal policies dating back to at least the 1950s. "For decades," Donovan said, "the government encouraged sprawl" with freeway construction and a "housing finance system that perpetuated the 'drive until you qualify' myth. "We learned from the housing crisis that home ownership is not for everyone," he said, but "transportation patterns can push families over the edge. The average family spends half their household budget on housing and transportation -- they have become the two biggest expenditures. Lenders bought into the "drive to qualify" myth as well, not accounting for the costs to buy into these [exurban] areas. Families found themselves driving dozens of miles to work, to buy groceries, to move theaters, spending nearly as much to fill their gas tanks as to pay for their mortgages, in some cases even more."

## Link – Generic TI

#### **Transportation infrastructure makes travel faster and more convenient, spurring suburbanization and increasing spatial growth of cities**

Brueckner, April 2000, Jan K. Brueckner, Department of Economics and Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, International Regional Science Review, “Urban Sprawl: Diagnosis and Remedies”

Although the allocation of land is governed by competition between urban and agricultural uses, the outcome has increasingly tipped in favor of urban use, leading to substantial spatial growth of cities and prompting criticism of urban sprawl. Economists believe that three underlying forces—population growth, rising household incomes, and transportation improvements—are responsible for this spatial growth (see Mieszkowski and Mills 1993). As the nation’s population expands, cities must grow spatially to accommodate more people. In addition, rising incomes affect urban growth because residents of the city demand more living space as they become richer over time. By itself, the greater demand for space causes the city to expand spatially as dwelling sizes increase. This effect is reinforced by the residents’ desire to carry out their greater housing consumption in a location where housing is cheap, namely the suburbs. So the spatial expansion due to rising incomes is strengthened by a price incentive favoring suburbanization. A similar phenomenon occurs in response to investment in freeways and other transportation infrastructure. Because such investment makes travel faster and more convenient, thus reducing the cost of commuting, consumers can enjoy cheap housing in the suburbs while paying smaller commuting-cost penalties. As a result, suburban locations look increasingly attractive as commuting costs fall, which spurs suburbanization and leads to spatial growth of the city. 162 INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL SCIENCE REVIEW (Vol. 23, No. 2, 2000) Job suburbanization has also occurred as cities have grown spatially. This relocation of jobs to the suburbs has been due in part to changes in the transport orientation of businesses. Rather than shipping their output through centrally located rail depots and port facilities, firms increasingly rely on truck transport and, thus, prefer the easy highway access (as well as the low cost) of suburban locations. However, the evidence shows that jobs also follow people. In other words, job suburbanization is partly a response to the suburbanization of the population, which occurs for the reasons discussed above. Thus, unlike the fundamental forces driving urban expansion, job suburbanization is partly an effect rather than a cause of this growth. Thurston and Yezer (1994) provide a useful empirical analysis of the interaction between job and population decentralization. The confluence of an expanding national population, rising incomes, and falling commuting costs makes the rapid expansion of cities in recent decades unsurprising. The real question is whether this expansion has been too rapid. In other words, does the invisible hand, which guides the conversion of land to urban use, push too hard in the direction of bigger cities

#### Transportation infrastructure leads to urban sprawl – EU proves

Christansen 11, (Petter Christiansen, Department of Mobility and Organization, TOI Report: Drivers behind urban sprawl in Europe, <https://www.toi.no/getfile.php/Publikasjoner/T%D8I%20rapporter/2011/1136-2011/1136-2011-el.pdf>)

Trans-European Transport network (TEN) is also an area that focuses on infrastructure investments and TEN is strongly related to the common market. A prerequisite for goods, persons and services to flow freely is that the quality of the infrastructure is good. The funding mainly goes to the modernization and development of high-speed trains. In Central and Eastern Europe, the largest share is devoted to the construction of highways (Milanovic et al. 2007:113). Eastern European countries have recently experienced a restructuring of the economy where they are more dependent on international transport. For example, both freight and passengers to the Western European market has increased significantly (ibid). The theoretical effects of increased investments in infrastructure and increased availability are summarized by Dieleman and Wegener (2004:314). Increased availability may contribute to new areas becoming attractive for residential, industrial and office space and thus can contribute to urban sprawl. Below we will associate this point with some empirical examples. In Greece, it appears that large-scale infrastructure investments, combined with poor political management, have led to urban sprawl associated with construction of both residents and industries. Transportation-related industries located along highways and formed their own districts. Residents also localized in these areas (Leontidou et al. 2007). Residents often follow jobs and industry. In more recent times investments related to the Olympics in 2004 contributed to urban sprawl. Developments related to the Olympic Games were spread over large parts of Attica. Industrial investments around the highways are also a driver of urban sprawl in Eastern Europe (Milanovic et al. 2007).

#### Empirical evidence for transit-enabled sprawl – Japan and America prove

Smith ’11 (Andrew Smith, Seattle Transit Blog, “Can Rail Cause Sprawl?”, <http://seattletransitblog.com/2011/03/29/can-rail-cause-sprawl/>, 29 Mar 2011 DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

First, I think it’s worth defining what “sprawl” is exactly. There are two main connotations to the word. The first images that comes to mind are far-flung environments far from the center-city, and the second are car-oriented, low density developments. Transit can certainly cause – or be the cause of – the first sort of “sprawl”. In Japan’s post-war boom, many heavy-rail transit lines were built through what had previously been farmlands around major cities. Areas such as the [Tama New Town](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tama_New_Town) were communities planned by the government around transit lines to ensure that new communities had enough infrastructure to become economically sustainable. The [line I lived on in Japan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denentoshi_Line) was built the same way in the 1950s. Transit-enabled sprawl has also taken place in America. The [streetcar suburbs](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Streetcar_suburb), while much closer than modern suburbs, were some of the first suburban developments enabled by motorized transport. While streetcar suburbs are generally less dense than center-cities, most streetcar suburbs that remain are more dense than the surrounding areas. In Seattle, Ballard, Fremont, the University District, Ravenna and Columbia City originally developed as streetcar suburbs. [This paper](http://faculty.washington.edu/chalana/urbdp565/ClayVeka_Final.pdf)by University of Washington student Clay H. Veka is a good introduction to the subject for those curious.

#### **Transportation infrastructure considered one of the main causes of urban sprawl – Jeddah proves**

Aljoufie et. al. ’12 (Mohammad Aljoufie, Department of Urban and Regional Planning King Abdulaziz University, “Spatial–temporal analysis of urban growth and transportation in Jeddah City, Saudi Arabia”, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789>, 6 Jan. 2012, DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

During the past decades, the city of Jeddah in Saudi Arabia has witnessed dramatic changes in its urban area, population and transportation. To better understand the relationship between urban growth and transportation, this paper aims to quantify and analyze the spatial–temporal relationship between urban growth and transportation for Jeddah using Remote Sensing (RS) and Geographic Information System (GIS) approaches. In this paper, eight urban growth and transportation indices were developed to analyze the relationship between spatial–temporal urban growth and transportation changes: (1) annual urban spatial expansion index, (2) land use change index, (3) population density index, (4) transportation infrastructure expansion index, (5) road density index, (6) road area density index, (7) urban trips density index, and (8) modal split change index. The results show that in the past four decades (1964–2007), Jeddah has experienced a rapid population growth, a large spatial expansion, rapidly changing land use and expanding transportation infrastructure. As transportation infrastructure expands with population growth, this expansion has not been able to accommodate increases in travel demand. This has led to an increase in urban congestion. The analysis further shows that transportation infrastructure expansion has stimulated Jeddah’s urban spatial expansion and residential area growth. The enormous spatial expansion has also caused significant changes in the daily share of travel modes. The developed indicators in the paper bridge the knowledge gap between urban growth and transportation research, as the results of this study provide a rich understanding of the relationship between urban growth and transportation in rapidly growing cities. Transportation plays a crucial role in urban development: transportation systems provide mobility for people and goods and influence patterns of growth and levels of economic activity through land accessibility ([Meyer & Miller, 2001](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0140)). Transportation infrastructure is considered one of the main causes of urban growth ([Bhatta, 2010](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0040)), as different studies reveal relationships between the development of high-speed roads,urban expansion, and growth in population ( [[Brotchie, 1991]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0050), [[Parker, 1995]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0160) and [[Priemus et al., 2001]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0165)).[Fan, Wang, Qiu, and Wang (2009)](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0080) demonstrate that transportation corridors play an important role in urban expansion. Urbantransportation systems are complex networks shaped by various geographical, social, economic, and environmental factors ([Wang, Lu, & Peng, 2008](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0180)). To understand this complexity, it is crucial to study the interactions and effect(s) produced by each of these factors, as they exhibit many patterns within urban growth that reshape urban spatial structures. In other words, urban growth is strongly related to transportation’s reciprocal causes and effects, as rapid growth of cities and their populations increase urban traffic ( [[Cervero, 2003]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0065) and [[Millot, 2004]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0145)), traffic congestion, and infrastructure pressure ( [[Allen and Lu, 2003]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0025), [[Bhatta, 2010]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0040) and [[Brueckner, 2000]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0055)). Previous studies have focused only on the causes and effects of the relationship between transportation and urban growth, while there is a lack of research on the spatial–temporal aspects of the relationship. A thorough understanding of the spatial–temporal processes o furban growth and urban dynamics, then, is necessary ( [[Bhatta, 2010]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0040), [[Bhatta et al., 2010]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0045) and [[Müller et al., 2010]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0155)) in enhancing and expanding our knowledge of the relationship between urban growth and commuting ([Zhao, Lu, & de Roo, 2011](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275112000789#b0205)).

## Link – Innovation

#### Innovations in transportation are empirically linked to urban sprawl

Gayda et al. ’03 (Sylvie, Françoise Boon, Nathalie Schaillée, Michael Batty, Elena Besussi, Nancy Chin, Guenter Haag, Jan Binder, Angelo Martino, Kari Lautso, Claude Noël, Rémi Dormois, October, Gayda: research director at development planning and transport consultancy Stratec, Batty: professor of planning at University College London, others cited without qualifications, “The Scatter Project – Sprawling Cities And Transport : From Evaluation To Recommendations”, <http://www.casa.ucl.ac.uk/scatter/download/ETC_scatter_gayda.pdf> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

A drastic change in the transport systems, by drastically decreasing travel times and travel costs, is perhaps the single most important enabling factor leading to urban sprawl. In many countries, the development of the private automobile and the corresponding growth of the highway system played that role. But, it should be noted that in United Kingdom for example, the development of urban sprawl and suburban housing was more related to the growth in the public transportation network than to the increase in car use. In London, for example, the growth of the suburbs began with the extension of the rail network to the suburbs in the 1860’s, producing a radial pattern of growth along the lines of transportation. The latter development of a more widely spread, circular pattern of growth was also a result of the development of public transportation, in this case by motor bus. The private automobile played little part in the development of urban sprawl.

## Link – Fed Involvement

#### Federal transportation policy is a major contributor to the decentralization of cities, which result in urban sprawl.

Knapp et. al, 2000, Gerrit Knaap, Emily Talen, Robert Olshansky, and Clyde Forrest @ Department of Urban and Regional Planning @ University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, <http://dnr.state.il.us/orep/pfc/balancedgrowth/pdfs/government.pdf>, “Government Policy and Urban Sprawl”

Transportation Policy. The influence of the federal government on urban development patterns via transportation policies and programs is less ambiguous, though the magnitude of influence and direction of causation remains in dispute. The federal government is a major underwriter of and direct participant in the construction of interstate and other highways. Highways increase accessibility. Increased accessibility decreases the advantages of central city location both for residents and firms, encouraging both to migrate towards suburban locations. Recent studies raise doubts, however, about whether highways follow suburbanization or whether suburbanization follows highway construction (See, Urban Transportation Center 1998 and Center for Neighborhood Technology 1998 for opposing points of view). This question of causation may never be fully resolved, but the cumulative results are indisputable. Other influential actions of the federal government are also indisputable: it spends less on public transit than it does on highways, it taxes gasoline much less than other nations, and it spends considerable sums to maintain the flow of oil from middle east. In part as a result of these federal policies, automobile drivers in the United States pay about 73 to 88 percent of the cost of automobile use. If non-monetary costs, such as air pollution are included, the percent of cost paid by automobile users falls to 53 to 69 percent (OTA 1995). Without doubt this is a major factor in the decentralization of U.S. cities.

## Link – Cheaper Transit

#### **Transportation subsidies cause urban sprawl – 2 separate city models prove.**

Su and DeSalvo, 7/24/08, Qing Su and Joseph S. DeSalvo, Department of Economics at Kent State University at Stark and Department of Economics at University of South Florida, Journal of Regional Science, Volume 48 (Issue 3), “The Effect of Transportation Subsidies on Urban Sprawl”

In a closed city model, in which population is exogenous and the spatial equilibrium utility level is endogenous, transportation subsidies result in relocation of households within the urban area. If, for example, auto subsidies increase, some transit users switch to auto and the modal boundary decreases. For those already using auto, income net of transportation cost increases. Consequently, these households consume more housing and move farther from the CBD. Thus, the effect on both transit users and auto users of an increase in auto subsidies contributes to urban sprawl. In the open city model, in which population is endogenous and the spatial equilibrium utility level is exogenous, transportation subsidies result in migration among areas. If, for example, auto subsidies increase in an urban area, disequilibrium spatial utility increases in that urban area, which attracts migration to the urban area. Increased population reduces the disequilibrium spatial utility level, and population growth ends when the exogenous spatial utility level is reestablished. The increase in population expands the spatial size of the urban area to meet the increased demand for housing. Thus, the theoretical effect is qualitatively the same in both models. Empirically, however, population is a major determinant of the spatial size of an urban area (Brueckner and Fansler, 1983; McGrath, 2005; Song and Zenou, 2006). Thus, to eliminate population as a regressor, which one would have to do in the open city model, would eliminate a major source of urban spatial growth. Also, as far as we know, no other researchers have employed the open city model in empirical analysis

#### Increased urban sprawl from population growth and subsidized transportation infrastructure

Striker ’11 (Dee Striker, San Francisco Chronicle, “What are the Causes of Urban Sprawl?”, <http://homeguides.sfgate.com/causes-urban-sprawl-2577.html>, 16 Jan 2011 DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

The Sierra Club notes that although population growth is not the only cause of urban sprawl, it is a major factor. Rapid population growth is a particularly large contributor to urban sprawl in the Western and Southern regions of the United States. A sharp increase in residents beyond the capacity of nearby urban centers necessitates the creation of new communities. As the regional population continues to increase, communities begin to spread farther and farther away from city centers. One condition that encourages urban sprawl, according to Towson University Center for Geographic Information Sciences, occurs when municipalities subsidize the cost of infrastructure such as roads and sewers to un- or under-developed areas. Such an action incentivizes the creation of communities outside of city centers without requiring comprehensive plans or suggesting alternative development options.

## Link – HSR

#### HSR specifically causes urban sprawl

Kambitsis 10, (Jason Kambitsis, City Planner and Wired Contributor, Wired: High-Speed Rail As a Conduit of Sprawl, <http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/03/high-speed-rail-and-sprawl/>)

It’s fast, it’s efficient and it is the future of transportation, but will high-speed rail cause sprawl? Yes, it could, warn some urban planners. Despite the promise of creating more densely populated urban centers, high-speed rail could do quite the opposite by making it easier for people to live far from urban centers. Let’s use California as an example, since high-speed rail has made the most progress there. The Golden State, long known as a trendsetter for transportation and environmental policy, has received more than $2.3 billion in stimulus spending toward a proposed line linking San Francisco to Los Angeles by way of the Central Valley. The money is earmarked for construction, land acquisition and engineering and it follows the $9.95 billion allocated by a state ballot initiative. If and when the line is completed by 2030, riders will zip between the two cities in 2 hours and 38 minutes and pay less than half what it would cost to fly. But that convenience could increase emigration from California’s urban centers to the exurbs and beyond. In other words, it could lead to more sprawl. An example of this can be seen in cities like Palmdale, which is 58 miles north of Los Angeles. By cutting the commute time between those two cities from 1hour and 25 minutes, to 27 minutes, outward growth of the Los Angeles area will undoubtedly continue. It’s easy to see why — home prices in Palmdale are more than half of those in L.A., and high-speed rail could make getting downtown as quick and easy as living downtown. Pushing people further into the exurbs runs counter to a major goal of high-speed rail, namely cutting our carbon output while creating denser, more sustainable communities. Before this conversation goes any farther it should be said adopting high-speed rail is fundamental to the country’s economic vitality because it provides cost-effective transportation options that link major commerce centers. It is in many ways more beneficial than the continued use of automobiles as the primary means of moving people around. The time is now and the technology is here. That said, there are some potential flaws regarding where stations are built and how the rail infrastructure is integrated with communities that could lead to sprawl. The goal for high-speed rail in the United States, as in Europe — which, like Japan, is held as a model for HSR — is linking large cities. But the big difference between the European and American approach is Europeans have made a large investment in rail and the accompanying infrastructure that links it with stations and communities. The United States, on the other hand, has invested heavily in a highway system. The result is our land use patterns are quite different. In addition to making rail a priority, Europe has long supported public transit and multi-modal transportation infrastructure that supports bicycling, walking and other ways of getting around. It has all but taken the car out of the equation and solved the so-called “last mile” problem — addressing how people get from the transit stop to their final destination. Public transit options, along with dense, compact communities built around transit hubs (an approach called transit oriented development, or TOD) has created inherent convenience and in many cases eliminated dependence on cars. In the United States it is a completely different story. We rarely embrace TOD. This could be a problem with  high-speed rail. Without a rapid transformation of our building patterns and a push to make existing communities denser, high-speed rail could be a conduit of sprawl, not a deterrent. If stations include vast parking lots, or they’re built in remote areas away from urban cores instead of being made a part of the community, it will all but guarantee people drive to the stations and create a system that is only accessible by car. Drivers already comfortable with a commute of an hour or more could move further away from urban centers, drive to a station and ride to work and still enjoy a shorter overall commute time. “HIgh-speed rail will simply add another layer of access to the far-flung suburbs/exurbs and Central Valley, resulting in more mass-produced subdivisions,” warns Robert Cervero, director of the University of California Transportation Center and author of Development Around Transit.

## Link – Highway Project

#### **Better highways are a primary cause of suburban growth today**

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis) sbucci

This process of suburban growth, commonly referred to as urban sprawl, n20 has become a way of life around major United States cities. Although the initial outward move from a city's central core may have been based mostly on population growth, affluence, and transportation accessibility, sprawled growth today is based largely on highway policy and unwise land use practices. n21 Suburban growth has rapidly escalated to a point where suburban inhabitants now make up over one-half of metropolitan populations. n22 Whereas new suburban rings surrounding a city used to take years to complete, suburban rings now seem to develop annually. n23 Indeed, one commentator notes that suburban growth has grown 10 times faster than the populations of urban centers, n24 and continued growth is expected for at least the next 25 years. n25

#### Interstate Highways system caused 17% decrease in central cities and 72% increase in surrounding areas

Baum-Snow ’06 (Nathanial Baum-Snow, Brown University Department of Economics, “Did Highways Cause Suburbanization?”, <http://www.econ.brown.edu/fac/nathaniel_baum-snow/hwy-sub.pdf>, 26 July 2006, DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

Between 1950 and 1990, the aggregate population of central cities in the United States declined by 17 percent despite population growth of 72 percent in metropolitan areas as a whole. This paper assesses the extent to which the construction of new limited access highways has contributed to central city population decline. Using planned portions of the interstate highway system as a source of exogenous variation, empirical estimates indicate that one new highway passing through a central city reduces its population by about 18 percent. Estimates imply that aggregate central city population would have grown byabout 8 percent had the interstate highway system not been built.

#### Interstate Highway exemplifies the urban sprawl generated from transportation infrastructure

Fishman ’00 (Robert Fishman, Rutgers Univesity, “The American Metropolis at Century’s End: Past and Future Influences”, <http://www.knowledgeplex.org/kp/text_document_summary/scholarly_article/relfiles/hpd_1101_fishman.pdf>, FMF 2000 DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

1. The 1956 Interstate Highway Act and the dominance of the automobile. Proclaimed the “largest public works program since the Pyramids,” the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System transformed the American metropolis in ways its planners never anticipated. The system was supposed to save the central cities by rescuing them from automobile congestion and also provide high-speed long-distance travel from city to city: “coast-to-coast without a traffic light.” But the massive new urban highways, intended to move traffic rapidly in and out of downtown, quickly became snarled in ever-growing congestion, and their construction devastated many urban neighborhoods. Meanwhile, the new peripheral “beltways,” originally designed to The American Metropolis at Century’s End 201enable long-distance travelers to bypass crowded central cities, turned into the Main Streets of postwar suburbia. Cheap rural land along the beltways became the favored sites for new suburban housing, shopping malls, industrial parks, and office parks that drew people and businesses out of the central cities. Finally, the interstate system was financed by a highway trust fund supported by the abundant revenue from federal gasoline taxes. Under the provisions of the 1956 act, these funds were available only for highways: The federal government paid 90 percent of the cost of the new highways, the localities only 10 percent. By contrast, localities paid a much higher percentage for investment in mass transit. This was a powerful incentive to neglect mass transit and focus a region’s transportation investments only on roads. More than any other measure, the 1956 highway act created the decentralized, automobile-dependent metropolis we know today.

#### Interstate Highway

Fishman ’00 (Robert Fishman, Rutgers Univesity, “The American Metropolis at Century’s End: Past and Future Influences”, <http://www.knowledgeplex.org/kp/text_document_summary/scholarly_article/relfiles/hpd_1101_fishman.pdf>, FMF 2000 DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

1. The 1956 Interstate Highway Act and the dominance of the automobile. Proclaimed the “largest public works program since the Pyramids,” the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System transformed the American metropolis in ways its planners never anticipated. The system was supposed to save the central cities by rescuing them from automobile congestion and also provide high-speed long-distance travel from city to city: “coast-to-coast without a traffic light.” But the massive new urban highways, intended to move traffic rapidly in and out of downtown, quickly became snarled in ever-growing congestion, and their construction devastated many urban neighborhoods. Meanwhile, the new peripheral “beltways,” originally designed to The American Metropolis at Century’s End 201enable long-distance travelers to bypass crowded central cities, turned into the Main Streets of postwar suburbia. Cheap rural land along the beltways became the favored sites for new suburban housing, shopping malls, industrial parks, and office parks that drew people and businesses out of the central cities. Finally, the interstate system was financed by a highway trust fund supported by the abundant revenue from federal gasoline taxes. Under the provisions of the 1956 act, these funds were available only for highways: The federal government paid 90 percent of the cost of the new highways, the localities only 10 percent. By contrast, localities paid a much higher percentage for investment in mass transit. This was a powerful incentive to neglect mass transit and focus a region’s transportation investments only on roads. More than any other measure, the 1956 highway act created the decentralized, automobile-dependent metropolis we know today.

## Link – Roads and/or Buses

#### **Small increase in roads and buses causes 2.8% increase in city population**

Duranton & Turner ’07 (Giles Duranton & Matthew Turner, University of Toronto, “Urban Growth and Transportation”, <http://www.economics.utoronto.ca/workingPapers/tecipa-305.pdf>, 19 Dec 2007, DOA: 21 June 2012 JOL)

We investigate how changes to a city’s supply of major roads and public transit in 1980 affect its growth over the next 20 years. Our investigation leads to the following conclusions. First, that a 10% increase in a city’s stock of roads causes about a 2% increase in its population and employment and a small decrease in its share of poor households over 20 years. Second, that a 10% increase in a city’s stock of large buses causes about a 0.8% population increase and a small increase in the poverty rate. Third, a back-of-the-envelope calculation based on these estimates suggests that road provision does not constitute a cost-effective growth strategy for a city, and that reallocating money from the provision of roads to the provision of buses would be welfare improving at the margin. Fourth, that changes in transportation infrastructure do not affect the composition of industrial activity in a city. Finally, we ﬁnd that an additional kilometer of major roadway allocated to a city at random is associated with a larger increase in population or employment than is a road assigned to a city by the prevailing political process. This is consistent with other evidence we uncover that local infrastructure spending rises when cities are hit by negative economic shocks. This last ﬁnding suggests that road construction may be a substitute for social assistance and that roads are built where land and labor are cheap rather than in the places where trafﬁc is heaviest.

## Link Magnifier

#### **Urban sprawl leads to loss in tax revenue and failure to provide adequate services – that leads to more flight from cities. This system is *cyclical* and exponentially increases the link – plus, it will turn the case**

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis) sbucci

To understand the need for change, it is important to understand the problems that sprawl creates. As populations have moved away from the urban core, sprawled development has continued to radiate outward, creating a variety of economic, social, and environmental issues. Any effective response to sprawl must somehow address and lessen these impacts.   *A. Economic Impacts*   Sprawled communities have three basic economic impacts on local governments--increased costs of public services, loss of a tax base, and urban core deterioration. n26 Although these impacts are intertwined, each having an impact on the other, they are discussed separately below.

1. Public Services

As an area's population reaches a critical mass, additional public services are required. A local government must provide new infrastructure, such as roads and bridges, schools, utilities, and police and fire departments, to service the growing population. n27 Infrastructure, of course, places a great cost on local governments and taxpayers, and creation of additional infrastructure multiplies that cost. n28 Although local governments might try to justify their decisions to approve sprawled development with a projected increased tax base, the cost of creating additional infrastructure greatly outweighs the revenue generated by new development. n29 The National Wildlife Federation, for example, notes that for every tax dollar paid, agricultural uses require only $ .37 in public services; new development, on the other hand, requires $ 1.15. n30 Part of the reason for the great burden imposed by new infrastructure costs lies in the fact that public services in settled areas already exist. As a community grows, the local government must provide new services to the outlying areas while also maintaining preexisting services for settled areas. n31 These preexisting services, for which payment may not yet be complete, must still be provided even when those areas become partially abandoned as residents move to outlying suburban rings. n32 As further rings grow, additional infrastructure costs are created. This cycle of costs impacts not only the local government, but also the local economy. As Prof. Robert Burchell explains:

The dual costs of (1) providing new infrastructure for those who are moving outward, and (2) maintaining the old infrastructure for the population and economic entities that are left behind, cause taxes and development costs to rise throughout the metropolitan area. These dual costs, in turn, cause a regional rise in the costs either to do business or to reside in the area. As a result, wage and product costs increase and companies and regions become less competitive. The reality of unplanned growth brings about a type of economic triage wherein a finite amount of money is allocated to prepare and access new areas while old areas are left to die. These are the middle-stage signs of a region that is becoming non-competitive and whose end state is a major loss of economic tenants. n33

Studies have shown three basic reasons for increased infrastructure costs. First, new development usually occurs in undeveloped areas. Therefore, rather than utilizing existing services, the development must have new services since none exist in that area. n34 Second, when those services are provided, they are generally at a greater cost because services for low-density development costs more than services for high-density development. n35 Indeed, as Professor Burchell notes, numerous studies have shown that large-lot single-family development not only causes public service costs to be excessive, it also increases residential housing and occupancy costs as well. n36 Finally, sprawled development uses public services inefficiently, rather than utilizing economies of scale, which would reduce the number of public service facilities required. n37

2. Taxes

Taxes, especially property taxes, form the basis of municipal funds for providing public services. n38 Urban sprawl impacts a municipality's tax base in two ways. First, municipal governments lose a portion of their tax base as residents--especially wealthy residents--move from the urban center to suburban rings. n39 As commercial businesses and manufacturing facilities follow the population, the municipality loses an even greater portion of its tax base. n40 With the loss in revenue, the municipality either must raise taxes, which creates the possibility of losing even more of its tax base, or lower the quality of its services, which leads to degeneration of the urban core. n41 Second, reliance on taxes for revenue creates incentives for further urban sprawl through the municipality's tendency to use "fiscal zoning." As Prof. Tom Daniels explains:

Fiscal zoning occurs when local governments zone land to encourage developments that will generate more in property taxes than they demand in services. The competition among communities and counties for stores, offices, gas stations, restaurants, factories, and high-value residential property tax "ratables" drives much of the struggle over land in the fringe. Property taxes commonly are lower on county or township land outside of incorporated cities and towns, because there are fewer public services to pay for . . . . Land costs are lower and the appreciation potential of real estate is often greater than in core cities and older suburbs. Thus, both businesses and households have strong incentives to locate in the metro-fringe countryside. n42

Because of the better opportunities offered by locating in outlying areas, businesses and residences escape the high taxes of the center city, but still receive the infrastructure benefits provided by the municipality. n43 However, as the suburb grows, the tax rates in that area will increase to help support the additional infrastructure needed to support the population, n44 which may lead to further sprawl as people and businesses leapfrog over the area to avoid the increased tax rate.

3. Urban Core Deterioration

A city's urban core begins to deteriorate as the population moves out to the suburban rings. Because those who can afford to move to the suburbs are generally upper or middle class, those who remain in the inner city tend to be the poor who can ill-afford to pay high taxes. n45 Further adding to the problem is the loss of jobs in the inner city. Inner-city businesses once provided ample employment opportunities to support low-wage earners. However, when businesses relocated to suburban areas, the jobs moved with them. n46 Because few low-wage earners have sufficient transportation to take them to suburban locations and public transportation to outlying areas is often lacking, n47 many inner-city workers are unemployed. n48 Unable to collect sufficient taxes from inner-city residents, the city's public services have suffered despite the need for greater services since it is those with low income who generally require greater health care and welfare support. n49 Even further burdening the city's coffers are the suburban commuters and visitors to the cities, neither of whom pay taxes but who still benefit from use of the core city infrastructure. n50 Thus, as city residents have continued their move to the suburbs, cities have become poorer (with most large cities having poverty rates above national average) n51 and now suffer increased "homelessness, violent crime, infant mortality, and crumbling infrastructure." n52 Even where attempts have been made to revitalize the central core, it remains "a struggling entity with no soft-goods retail anchors, no quality supermarkets or movie theaters, a downwardly mobile population, public school systems being replaced by private, and increasingly higher property taxes to pay for rising public service costs." n53

## Impact – Laundry List

#### Urban Sprawls leads to spatial, environmental, and political fragmentation, classism, and racism

Altinok et al 8 (Emrah Altınok and Hüseyin Cengiz, PhD in Urban Political Economy and Head of the Department of City and Regional Planning at Yildiz Technical University, The Effects of Urban Sprawl on Spatial Fragmentation and Social Segregation in Istanbul, <http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/1302.pdf>)

Limiting the adverse environmental effects of urban sprawl is included in the actions determined by OECD regarding the problems related with urbanization and spatial development (OECD, 2001:18). Incorporation of urban sprawl in the environmental strategies, goals and policies of OECD certainly implies that the environmental side of the problem is absolutely important. However, it should be noted that the urban-spatial and social effects of the phenomenon are already being widely debated in literature. In this paper mainly two facts related with the social and spatial effects of urban sprawl are examined. These two are social segregation and spatial fragmentation. Generally, it is observed that four aspects of fragmentation are emphasized in literature. First issue is the spatial aspects of fragmentation. In this scope, discordance of urban land use and physical properties of the space, spatial atomization and general lack of integration of the city are the main areas of debate. In particular, increasing separation of functions like housing, business, recreation and shopping, over the urban space is defined as an important mrah Altınok and Hüseyin Cengiz, The Effects of Urban Sprawl on Spatial Fragmentation and Social Segregation in Istanbul, 44th ISOCARP Congress 2008 4 problem area. Second dimension of the fragmentation is the environmental aspect. Here, particularly the disintegration and depletion of rural lands with their natural assets due to use throughout the urban development process is discussed and accordingly disintegration of agricultural and forest lands constitutes the main area of debate. This point can also be regarded as the closest relation of the concept with urban sprawl. Third aspect is the political-administrative fragmentation. Related with this issue, it is observed that are mostly the division of massive cities and metropolitan regions into numerous administrative units and failing of local administrative units to introduce an integral approach for the space with collaborative policies and strategies is deliberated. Furthermore, there are several opinions agreeing that by representing a postmodern planning approach existence of multiple local administrative units will create a boosting effect on the competition on private property and this effect will in turn perpetuate the urban sprawl 1 . Fourth aspect of fragmentation can be expressed as social fragmentation. Social fragmentation notion can be said to be defined with an approach based on poverty and deprivation, otherness, being a minority member, racial discrimination, social and classbased segregation concepts. At this point, it can be stated that the social side of fragmentation is also closely related with the social segregation.

#### Urban Sprawl cause air pollution, water overconsumption, loss of biodiversity, racial and economic disparity, and obesity

Grabkowski ’05 (Leonardo R. Grabkowski, writer for San Francisco Chronicle, “Negative Effects of Urban Sprawl”, <http://homeguides.sfgate.com/negative-effects-urban-sprawl-1716.html>, 2005, DOA: 22 June 2012 JOL)

Urban sprawl is a growing concern in all of America. When choosing your next residence, consider the negative effects of urban sprawl, and their impact on you, your community and the environment. Increased Air Pollution Longer and more frequent commutes are a major concern associated with urban sprawl. The average American spends the equivalent of eight 55-hour work weeks behind the steering wheel of a car annually, according to the Sierra Club. More driving leads to more air pollution, which can contribute to poor health and smog problems. Water Overconsumption Spreading out development creates water distribution problems and can lead to water overconsumption. A typical low-density or suburban community uses more water than a high-density city community. Landscaping is the primary culprit for this excessive use of water. According to the EPA, 30 percent of the water used daily in the United States is devoted to outdoor use. Loss of Wildlife Habitat The San Francisco Bay Area, with over 400,000 acres of natural landscape, is one of the nation’s six hotspots for biological diversity, according to the Center for Biological Diversity. The region has a wide variety of plant and animal species; unfortunately, 90 of them, including the California tiger salamander, are listed as endangered or threatened. Rapid development can negatively affect wildlife by tearing down, clearing, or building over its habitat, potentially threatening survival. This is not only a problem in the San Francisco Bay Area; it’s a problem in all of America. Increased Racial and Economic Disparity When residents relocate outside of a city’s core, they take their tax dollars with them. Often, it’s the city’s poorest residents that are left behind. This creates economic disparity and stratification based upon location. It also creates funding problems for the core, which directly affects the money available for education, crime prevention, and maintenance and upkeep. Urban sprawl can also lead to economic “white flight.” According to “Urban Sprawl: A Reference Guide,” urban sprawl leads to racial segregation as minorities are often left behind in the poorest parts of a region. This problem may not be as widespread as it has been in the past, but it's present nonetheless. Increased Risk of Obesity People living in suburban areas are more likely to be obese than people living in urban areas, according to the Ontario College of Family Physicians and the American Planning Association. Both studies show that people living in suburban areas tend to rely on their vehicles more often--even for short trips--instead of walking or cycling. This lower level of activity increases the risk of obesity, which can lead to other health problems such as heart disease, high-blood pressure and diabetes.

#### Urban Sprawl bad socially, economically, and ecologically – multiple reasons

Luther ’05 (T. Luther, writer for 1000 Friends of Florida, “Some negative effects of urban sprawl”, <http://www.interfacesouth.org/products/changing-roles/changing-roles-notebook/module-3/fact-sheets/mod3fs4.pdf>, 2005 DOA: 22 June 2012 JOL)

Development plans that promote sprawl have a number of consequences for local ecosystems (Luther 2005). Many hold true for any development in the wildland-urban interface. • Destruction of wildlife habitat. • Introduction of non-native invasive plants and animals into natural areas. • Increased human and pet exposure to diseases such as rabies and Lyme disease. • Increased risks of water pollution from oil and gasoline washing off paved surfaces and from pesticides, lawn fertilizers, and other chemicals. • Increased potential for flooding and soil erosion due to impervious surfaces such as concrete or pavement. • Decrease in groundwater for wells and irrigation caused by abundance of impervious surfaces. • Increased risk to life and property from wildfires. Traffic is one side-effect of sprawl. Urban sprawl can also negatively affect social and economic conditions in communities in several ways (Luther 2005). • Increased community costs for maintaining roads, school bus routes, sewers, and other services needed when businesses and residences are spread out. • Ongoing increases in property taxes to meet growing need for services, which may pressure rural landowners to sell to developers. • Increased need for automobiles; increased noise, traffic, pollution; reduced potential for bicycling and walking. • Isolation of the young, poor, and elderly who cannot drive or lack access to cars. • Increased cost and difficulty of providing public transportation. • Increased time needed for transportation reduces time available to spend with family and friends or contributing to the community. • Loss of agricultural and forestry jobs, and traditional land practices. • Reduction of rural character or community sense of place. • Increased ordinances that regulate logging, noise, or odors.

#### Urban sprawl causes multiple impact, including ground-level ozone formation

Stone, March 2008, Brian Stone Jr., City and Regional Planning Program @ College of Architecture, Georgia Institute of Technology, Journal of Environmental Management Volume 86 (Issue 4), “Urban Sprawl and Air Quality in Large US Cities”

Identified in the popular media as the source of numerous social, environmental, and economic ills, the phenomenon of urban sprawl is increasingly the subject of more rigorous inquiry in the peer-reviewed literatures on economics, urban planning, and public health. Generally defined as decentralized land use patterns characterized by low population densities and auto-oriented design schemes, urban sprawl has been demonstrated to greatly elevate the cost of urban services by increasing the distance between new development and the established infrastructure of roads, sewer lines, and transit systems (Burchell et al., 2002; Real Estate Research Corporation, 1974). Additional work has associated sprawling urban development patterns with increased vehicle travel and congestion (Ewing et al., 2003; Downs, 1992), increased volumes of stormwater runoff (Stone and Bullen, 2006), loss of prime agricultural lands (Heimlich and Anderson, 2001), and, perhaps most provocatively, increased rates of obesity in children and adult populations (Frumkin et al., 2004). In this study, I explore the implications of urban form for air quality within the largest metropolitan regions of the United States. Through the integration of data on land use attributes and air quality trends recorded in 45 of the 50 largest US metropolitan regions, a quantitative index of urban sprawl is associated with the emissions of ozone precursors and the annual number of high ozone days in each region between 1990 and 2002. While a handful of studies has demonstrated an association between various attributes of urban development and vehicle emissions in individual cities (Frank et al., 2000; Johnston et al., 2000), this work is the first to assess the implications of sprawl for an ambient measure of regional air quality in multiple cities while controlling for population, precursor emissions, and meteorological attributes significant to ozone formation. Specifically, this study addresses two principal research questions. First, are metropolitan regions characterized by high levels of sprawl associated with a greater quantity of ozone precursor emissions from vehicles and industry than more compact regions And, second, do metropolitan regions characterized by high levels of sprawl experience a greater number of annual ozone exceedances than more compact regions The significance of these questions lies in their potential to inform land-use strategies to combat air pollution in large cities. The results of this study indicate that for the 45 US metropolitan regions surveyed urban form is significantly associated with both ozone precursor emissions and ozone exceedances during a 13-year study period. Significantly, a positive association between sprawl and ozone exceedances was found to hold true when controlling for average ozone season (May through September) temperatures and annual emissions of chemical precursors to ozone formation, suggesting that the well-established linkage between decentralized development patterns and auto use may be only one of multiple mechanisms through which sprawl influences air quality. Overall, the most sprawling cities were found to experience over 60% more high ozone days than the most compact cities.

#### Congestion, pollution, crime, disease describe the outcome in 20 years from continuing urban sprawl

Science News ’12 (Science News, upi.com, “Problems of urban sprawl discussed”, <http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2012/03/27/Problems-of-urban-sprawl-discussed/UPI-51621332887950/#ixzz1yZXoJ2R0>, March. 27, 2012 DOA: 22 June 2012 JOL)

Humanity's urban footprint on Earth will expand by an area equal to France, Germany and Spain combined in less than 20 years, researchers say. That ongoing pattern of urban sprawl puts humanity at severe risk due of environmental problems, scientists at the "Planet Under Pressure" scientific conference in London were told, but "options and opportunities" are possible, researchers said. Reforms in existing cities and better planning of new ones offer disproportionately large environmental benefits compared with other options, Shobhakar Dhakal of the Tokyo-based Global Carbon Project told the conference attendees. "Re-engineering cities is urgently needed for global sustainability," Dhakal, said, noting emerging urban areas "have a latecomer's advantage in terms of knowledge, sustainability thinking, and technology to better manage such fundamentals as trash and transportation." "Our focus should be on enhancing the quality of urbanization -- from urban space, infrastructure, form and function, to lifestyle, energy choices and efficiency." Failure to do so risks unwelcome potential problems of dense urbanization including congestion, pollution, crime, the rapid spread of infectious disease and other societal problems, he said. Other researchers agreed. "The way cities have grown since World War II is neither socially or environmentally sustainable and the environmental cost of ongoing urban sprawl is too great to continue," Karen Seto of Yale University said.

### Terminals to L.L. Items

#### Air pollution kills 70,000 people in the U.S. every year—the impact is linear.

Roberts 2 — Bernie Fischlowitz-Roberts, Analyst at the Earth Policy Institute, 2002 (“Air Pollution Fatalities Now Exceed Traffic Fatalities by 3 to 1,” Earth Policy Institute, September 17th, Available Online at http://www.earth-policy.org/plan\_b\_updates/2002/update17, Accessed 06-10-2012)

The World Health Organization reports that 3 million people now die each year from the effects of air pollution. This is three times the 1 million who die each year in automobile accidents. A study published in The Lancet in 2000 concluded that air pollution in France, Austria, and Switzerland is responsible for more than 40,000 deaths annually in those three countries. About half of these deaths can be traced to air pollution from vehicle emissions. In the United States, traffic fatalities total just over 40,000 per year, while air pollution claims 70,000 lives annually. U.S. air pollution deaths are equal to deaths from breast cancer and prostate cancer combined. This scourge of cities in industrial and developing countries alike threatens the health of billions of people. Governments go to great lengths to reduce traffic accidents by fining those who drive at dangerous speeds, arresting those who drive under the influence of alcohol, and even sometimes revoking drivers' licenses. But they pay much less attention to the deaths people cause by simply driving the cars. While deaths from heart disease and respiratory illness from breathing polluted air may lack the drama of deaths from an automobile crash, with flashing lights and sirens, they are no less real. Air pollutants include carbon monoxide, ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and particulates. These pollutants come primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels, principally coal-fired power plants and gasoline-powered automobiles. Nitrogen oxides can lead to the formation of ground-level ozone. Particulates are emitted from a variety of sources, primarily diesel engines. "Smog"-a hybrid word used to describe the mixture of smoke and fog that blankets some cities-is primarily composed of ozone and particulates.

#### This impact will only get worse—every reduction in air pollution saves thousands of lives.

Plumer 12 — Brad Plumer, Reporter focusing on energy and environmental issues for the *Washington Post*, previously served as Associate Editor at *The New Republic*, 2012 (“What’s going to kill us in 2050? Air pollution — and lots of it,” *WONKblog*—a *Washington Post* blog, March 15th, Available Online at http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/whats-going-to-kill-us-in-2050-air-pollution--and-lots-of-it/2012/03/15/gIQAgiDgES\_blog.html, Accessed 06-10-2012)

Air pollution [is] tends to get wildly underrated as a public health concern. Everyone knows malaria is deadly. Or that access to clean water is a problem. And yet, in the next few decades, air pollution will kill far more people than both of those things combined, according to a new report. On Wednesday, the OECD released its “Environmental Outlook to 2050,” which contained a few spots of cheery news. Humanity is making steady progress against malaria. Worldwide, the number of deaths from the disease are expected to fall by half by 2050. And fewer people will die from unsafe drinking water and poor sanitation in the future. But the number of deaths caused by air pollution — which includes ground-level ozone, particulate matter, and “indoor pollution” — are expected to skyrocket, killing more than 6 million people per year by mid-century. Here’s the chart: [graphic chart omitted] (OECD Environmental Outlook 2050) The situation is particularly acute in India. In 2010, about 90 people out of every million died prematurely from ground-level ozone, which is formed when emissions from power plants, vehicles and factories react with sunlight. The resulting pollution can “trigger a variety of health problems including chest pain, coughing, throat irritation, and congestion. It can worsen bronchitis, emphysema, and asthma.” And by 2050, according to the OECD, about 130 Indians out of every million are likely to die prematurely from exposure. Wealthy countries aren’t immune, either, especially as places like the United States and Europe age, given that the elderly are especially sensitive to ozone pollution. While it’s technically feasible to reduce ground-level ozone, these control measures tend to be pricey and controversial — the Obama White House nixed stricter ozone standards last September for this very reason. Other pollutants, however, could prove much easier to tackle. Take particulate pollution, which the OECD expects will kill 3.6 million people per year by 2050. A lot of lung-damaging particulate matter comes from the burning of fossil fuels. And actions to curb them can prove quite cost-effective. The EPA’s new regulations on mercury, for instance, will reduce U.S. particulate pollution, as coal plants install new scrubbers. That, the agency estimates, will save an estimated 11,000 lives per year by 2016 and deliver between $36 billion to $89 billion per year in health benefits. And all for a cost of $9.6 billion per year.

## Impact – Environment

#### Urban Sprawl costs the environment significantly

Johnson & Wattenberg ’06 (Hans Johnson & Ben Wattenberg, CBS News & The first Measeared Century, “Environmental Literacy Council: Urban Sprawl”, <http://www.enviroliteracy.org/article.php/409.html>, 2006 DOA: 22 June 2012 JOL) Although there are a variety of benefits to development, urban sprawl has its drawbacks. The change in land use through the building of roads, homes, and businesses can fragment or eliminate animal habitats, blocking feeding areas and altering migration patterns. An increase in pavement and other covered surfaces that are not able to absorb rain or runoff can also contribute to an increase in the discharge of pollutants into area water sources, lakes, and streams. In addition, the reliance on transportation routes can elevate air emissions as the number of cars per person and the amount of time spent on the road increases.

## Impact – BioD

#### Sprawling communities are biodiversity’s worst enemy—six warrants

Hansen et al. ’05 (Andrew, Richard Knight, John Marzluff, Scott Powell, Kathryn Brown, Patricia Gude, Kingsford Jones, December, Hansen: professor of ecology at Montana State University, Knight: professor of natural resources at Colorado State University, Marzluff: professor of wildlife-habitat relationships at University of Washington, Powell: assistant research professor of geographic information science at Montana State University, Brown: masters in landscape biodiversity from Montana State University, Gude: masters in landscape biodiversity from Montana State University, Jones: graduate student at Montana State University, Ecological Applications 15(6), “Effects Of Exurban Development On Biodiversity: Patterns, Mechanisms, And Research Needs”, <http://www.islandplan.org/doc.php/HansenEt2005ExurbanDvlVsBiodiv.pdf?id=2002> DOA: 6/22/12 ARW)

Our major conclusion is that exurban development is a pervasive and fast-growing form of land use that is substantially understudied by ecologists and has large potential to alter biodiversity. Covering about 25% of the land area of the conterminous United States in 2000 (Brown et al. 2005), area in exurban land use increased since 1974 at rates in excess of area in urban or agricultural land uses. Ecologists have traditionally focused research on wild or semi-wild lands (Miller and Hobbs 2002). The relatively few studies on exurban development are mostly done as contrasts to urban land use. Consequently, knowledge of the effects of exurban density, spatial conﬁguration, and homeowner behavior on biodiversity, and speciﬁc mechanisms for response is poorly developed. The relatively few studies on exurban development suggest that its impacts on biodiversity may be substantial, both in the immediate vicinity of homes and even on adjacent or even distant public lands. These impacts are summarized as follows. 1) Many native species incur reduced survival and reproduction near homes and consequently native species richness generally drops with increased exurban densities. At the same time, some exotic species and some human-adapted native species generally increase with intensity of exurban development. 2) The relationship between these elements of biodiversity and intensity of exurban development are sometimes nonlinear, with sharp thresholds were biodiversity changes abruptly with incremental increases in exurban intensity. Knowledge of these thresholds is important for managing exurban development to achieve biodiversity objectives. 3) These affects may be manifest for several decades following exurban development, so that biodiversity is likely still responding to the wave of exurban expansion that has occurred since 1950. 4) The location of exurban development is often nonrandom relative to biodiversity because both are inﬂuenced by biophysical factors such that they are concentrated in more equitable landscape settings. Consequently, the effects on biodiversity may be disproportionately large relative to the area of exurban development. 5) The effects of exurban development on biodiversity likely differ among ecosystem types. Additional research is needed to derive generalities on the types of ecosystems that are relatively vulnerable to exurban development. 6) An identiﬁable set of ecological mechanisms link exurban development and biodiversity. More research is needed on these mechanisms and the resulting knowledge can help with understanding, managing, and mitigating these impacts. 7) In addition to local effects, exurban development may alter ecological processes and biodiversity on adjacent and distant public lands. Consequently, exurban development in rural areas may have even more important impacts than in the urban fringe because of the elevated inﬂuence on lands dedicated to conservation and on wilderness species that are rare in human-dominated landscapes.

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction

Angermeier 95 [Paul L. Angermeier, is with the National Biological Survey, Virginia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences, “Ecological Attributes of Extinction-Prone Species: Loss of Freshwater Fishes of Virginia,” Conservation Biology, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Feb., 1995), pp. 143-158, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2386396 ]

A primary goal of conservation biology is to provide principles by which biological diversity can be pre- served in the face of increasing anthropogenic impact (Soule 1985). One of the most obvious and permanent forms of biodiversity loss is species extinction. Of particular concern is extirpation or human-induced extinc- tion. Understanding extinction processes and develop- ing management strategies to keep them at natural rates are major research objectives of conservation biologists. Extinction is rarely cataclysmic. Rather, it is incremental, with total extinction preceded by local or regional extinctions. Although local extinctions do not necessar-ily lead to total extinction, analysis of local extinction patterns can provide insights into larger-scale extinction processes. Previous analyses of extinction patterns indicate that species vary in their vulnerability to extinction".Extinc-tion-prone" species typically have populations that are small, slow growing, or fluctuating (Terborgh & Winter 1980; Karr 1982a; Reid & Miller 1989). Frequently cited ecological traits include large body size, high trophic position, poor dispersal/colonization ability, re-stricted geographic range, colonial or migratory habits, and specialization on food or habitat resources (Ter-borgh 1974; Terborgh & Winter 1980; Reid & Miller 1989; Peltonen & Hanski1991). Because the literature on extinction-prone species is based largely on island forest birds(Terborgh1974; Terborgh & Winter 1980; Karr 1982a, 1982b, 1990), it is not surprising that most traits listed above reflect populations' sensitivity to de- creasing habitat area and increasing isolation (insular- ization). The ability to predict extinctions reliably on the basis of ecological attribute should be a powerful tool for conservation biologists because it provides a basis for preventive (proactive) management. A major short com- ing of most existing species conservation programs is that they are not activated until after a species has de- clined seriously-they are reactive-by which time it is usually difficult to avert extinction(Scott et al. 1988). The need for proactive conservation measures is obvi- ous, but few programs(such as gap analysis; Scott et al. 1993) have been developed to prevent species endan- germent and extirpation. Given the currently accelerat-ing rates of endangerment, however, proactive strate- gies may offer the only effective means of curbing biodiversity loss. Except for studies of island birds, associations be- tween ecological attributes and susceptibility to extinc- tion rarely have been tested rigorously. In particular, little is known regarding(1) the variability of extinction patterns and processes among taxa and habitats, and(2) the similarity between natural and human-induced ex- tinction patterns. Insularization is likely to be the pri-mary determinant of extinction dynamics for terrestrial species in reserves surrounded by virtua lseas of dis- turbed land. It is not clear, however, that the traits listed above also predispose species to extirpation following general environmental degradation over large spa- tiotemporal scales. Yet, biodiversity loss from real land- scapes typically is due to multiple anthropogenic im- pacts, including insularization, contaminants, and exotic species. A clearer understanding of the extinction pat- terns produced in complex scenarios of degradation is needed before effective programs to prevent extirpation can be developed.The aquatic systems of North America provide an ap- propriate context in which to examine patterns of ex- tinction and extirpation. Aquatic degradation through habitat loss, introduction of exotics, and pollution is causing high rates of endangerment and extinction among aquatic species (Milleret al. 1989; Wiliamset al. 1989; Williams et al.1993). Master (1990) estimates that rates of imperilment within major aquatic taxa such as fishes, crayfishes, and mussels are three to eight times those for birds and mammals. Thus, analysis of extirpa- tion patterns in aquatic systems should be useful in iden- tifying general principles regarding vulnerability of spe- cies to extinction.

## Impact – Food Shortages

#### Urban expansion guts agriculture

Mylott ’09 (Elizabeth, February 20, research assistant at Portland State University, “Urban-Rural Connections: A Review of the Literature”, <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/10574/Urban-RuralConnectionsLitReview.pdf?sequence=1> DOA: 6/23/12 ARW)

Urban, suburban and exurban expansion are altering the agricultural industry presenting new challenges and new possibilities for agriculture. The growth of urban areas threatens agricultural production. (Lockeretz, 1986) As development spreads, it competes with agriculture for land. Conflicts often arise when residential developments are located near farmland. Pesticide use and the all-night work that occurs during parts of the crop cycle are some of the issues around which conflict arises. Issues relating to farming in peri-urban areas include the increased demand for land for urban development, new employment opportunities for urban areas and increased market opportunities for local producers. (Illbery, 1985) “The irony of the situation is obvious: While farming creates and maintains the atmosphere and bucolic landscape so many wish to be part of, it is the business of agriculture, which mandates certain practices and functions that many find offensive.” (Otte, 1974; Vesterby, et al, 1994; Heimlich, 1989) New York State pioneered the movement to protect agricultural land when it passed Right to Farm laws in 1972. (Lapping, et al, 1983)

## Impact – Quality of Life/Systemic

This inevitably leads to economic and RACIAL *segregation* because of unemployment, poverty, and federal housing policy, as well as *educational discrimination*

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis) sbucci

Along with economic impacts, urban sprawl has serious social impacts, including economic and racial segregation, disparity in educational opportunities, and psychological impacts on society.

1. Economic and Racial Segregation

At the top of the list is the economic and racial segregation that occurs as city populations have moved to the suburbs. As mentioned above, loss of business in the urban core has impacted the ability of inner-city residents to garner and maintain employment. n54 Not only are there fewer low-wage jobs available because of the urban business center's shift to white-collar employment opportunities, n55 but the lack of reliable transportation impairs the inner-city residents' ability to reach the suburban jobs that are available. n56 Concentrated poverty, reduced public services, and other social problems result. n57 Sprawl has also helped fuel a racially segregated society. n58 Studies show that African Americans have a disproportionate likelihood of living in central cities than their non-Hispanic white counterparts. n59 This segregation is the result of several forces: white flight; n60 wealth disparity; and denial of housing opportunities. Creation of the suburbs has enabled white residents to flee what they have perceived to be deteriorating conditions due to increases in minority populations in the central city and inner suburban rings. n61 As businesses followed the moving population, employment opportunities decreased, creating poor inner-city residents without the means to move to the suburbs. n62 Even those minorities who have tried to move, however, have found it difficult because of limited housing opportunities. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) has played a large role in racially segregating the inner city and the suburbs through its mortgage interest program, which preferentially provided mortgage insurance (and a resultant lower interest rate) for "low-risk areas," that is, "areas that were thinly populated, dominated by newer homes, and without African-American or immigrant enclaves nearby--areas that disproportionately tended to be suburban." n63 The Home Owners Loan Corporation also played a role in denying housing opportunities by "redlining" high-risk areas, which were the areas ignored by the FHA's mortgage insurance program. n64 Sellers contributed to the problem by the inclusion of "restrictive covenants, buyer steering, [and] indirect or off-market sales (i.e., sales occurring by word-of-mouth)." n65 In addition, local governments have contributed to a racially segregated city by the enactment of exclusionary zoning. Exclusionary zoning is "a generic term for zoning restrictions that effectively exclude a particular class of persons from a locality by restricting the land uses those persons are likely to require." n66 When a local government enacts zoning that prohibits multifamily housing or requires a minimum lot size, the government has excluded from those zones people who can only afford multifamily housing or who cannot afford the costs of a large-lot residence. n67

2. Educational Disparity

Schools and educational opportunities are also impacted by sprawl. Because property taxes form the basis for most school funding, n68 schools in poorer communities suffer because less money is available for education. n69 Unlike most suburban schools, urban schools are generally located in poorer areas, which places them at a financial disadvantage. n70 Urban schools also tend to educate a student body that is at a lower socioeconomic level n71 and is disproportionately minority, n72 especially in the larger cities, n73 educating "two-thirds of all African-American students, nearly [one-half] of other minority students, but less than [one-quarter] of white students." n74 In comparison to suburban students, the educational needs of urban students (many of whom come from disadvantaged backgrounds) are much higher. n75 Indeed, students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds "suffer more from malnutrition and poor health care; lack of parental involvement and a nurturing, stimulating home environment; frequent changes of residence; and exposure to violence and drug use." n76 These disadvantages require greater resources, and though some effort has been made to relieve the economic disparity between urban and suburban schools, the disparity still exists. n77 Because educational opportunities lead to better employment opportunities, those who attend inner-city schools are at a marked disadvantage in the job market later in life. n78 To get ahead, inner-city students must overcome not only the educational inadequacies brought on by poor school districts, n79 but also the self-fulfilling prophecies perpetuated by low expectations of the school system and influence from classroom peers. Schools located in poverty-stricken areas tend to operate with low expectations for the success of their students, n80 which can lead to students' own similarly low expectations and poor performance. Indeed, studies show urban students generally perform lower on standardized tests n81 and drop out of school at higher rates than suburban students. n82 Further, urban students must fight the influence of their own peers and the "oppositional counterculture" that racial segregation creates. n83 The result is often the student's own intentionally poor performance, which further separates the urban student from the suburban vision of success. n84

**NEED GOOD POVERTY FIRST CARD**

## Impact – Kills Democracy

#### **Urban Sprawl lowers civic participation**

Reed 3 (Daniel Reed, Masters of Sociology, URBAN SPRAWL AND SUBURBANIZATION’S NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON CIVIC PARTICIPATION, http://athenaeum.libs.uga.edu/bitstream/handle/10724/7036/reed\_daniel\_c\_200312\_ma.pdf?sequence=1)

Political scientists and historians have frequently commented on the decline of civic engagement in America in the last 30 years. Since the 1960s, Americans have voted less often, have volunteered for political campaigns less, have attended less political rallies and public meetings, and have generally thought to have been less interested in civic life (Putnam 2000). There have been many suggested culprits for this decline in civic participation: the deteriorating quality of the nation’s public schools, rising rates of divorce, the growth of the welfare state, the public’s disillusion with politics after Watergate and Vietnam, the baby-boomers, and even Supreme Court decisions regarding racial integration and busing. Others have suggested that the decline is relative, that the 1950s and 1960s were periods of unusually high civic engagement, and that America is merely returning to normal levels of civic activity 1 . However, there has been another trend in America in the last half-century which might be partially responsible for the decline in civic participation: “suburbanization.” Normally, when one thinks of the ill effects of suburbia, one might think of its impact on the physical environment. The rise of low density housing and automobile traffic, as well as the boom of the interstate highway system in the 1950s (which helped make living in the suburbs possible) has arguably wreaked havoc on natural ecosystems. But, what have been the social consequences of suburbanization? Some have argued that the sudden surge in available, affordable housing after WWII sparked a pattern of “white-flight,” or the emigration of white, middle-class Americans from cities to the suburbs (Mieszkowski and Mills 1993). As a consequence, many inner cities deteriorated, as their wealth and energy were transported to the suburbs. But can suburbanization affect rates of civic participation as well? For the purposes of this thesis, I argue that urban sprawl and suburbanization have an adverse effect on the development of social bonds, and therefore they hinder the ability of their inhabitants to participate civically. By separating residences from businesses and public spaces, suburbs effectively sever community and social networks. Conversely, more traditional communities have geographic, residential, and business traits that are more conducive to civic participation. Much of the potential effect comes from the pressures of increased daily commuting. Basically, if one considers the lives of suburbanized Americans as a constant and hurried journey from workplace to “shopping-place” to home (a sort of “triangle” of daily travel)(Putnam 2000), one can easily see how they might be unable to engage each other in any meaningful way. As will be discussed in Chapter 4, frequent interaction with others in one’s neighborhood is necessary to develop real bonds with the greater community. However, when suburbanites spend several hours a day alone in their cars (commuting and running errands), it can be very difficult to develop social attachments to other members of their communities. In this thesis, I argue that an over reliance on the automobile has detrimental effects on civic engagement.3 However, much of the negative effect also comes from the creation of a sort of “pseudo-community” of urban sprawl. The urban sprawl counterpart to suburbs creates the appearance of an urbanized metropolitan area, without many of the traditional components of a functional community, such as public parks, pedestrian-oriented city centers, and other public spaces. Without these kinds of outlets for civic participation, individuals in an urban sprawl environment are effectively isolated from other citizens. Contrasted with those living in traditional communities (where the inhabitants are practically forced to interact with one another on a daily basis due to the physical layout of their environment), suburbanites have far fewer opportunities for informal “social capital”-building activities. While, obviously, there are many hermits living in traditional communities and socialites living in suburbs, it is possible that the physical layout of inhabited areas either can be conducive to or inhibiting of the civic participation of its inhabitants. Therefore, I argue that urban sprawl and suburbanization have an adverse effect on the propensity of its individual residents to participate civically. In this paper, I examine the individual-level effects of growing up in traditional and suburban environments on later civic participation.

## Turns Case

#### Turns case—more transportation problems arise and people continue use cars anyway

Ewing et al. ’02 (Reid, Rolf Pendall, Don Chen, Ewing: professor of metropolitan planning at University of Utah, former director of the Voorhees Transportation Center at Rutgers University, Pendall: director of the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at Urban Institute, former director of graduate studies in city and regional planning at Cornell University, Chen: Senior Program Officer at Ford Foundation, former executive director of Smart Growth America, “Measuring Sprawl and Its Impact”, <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/MeasuringSprawlTechnical.pdf> DOA: 6/21/12 ARW)

The relationships found between urban sprawl and the quality of life outcomes show that traffic and transportation-related problems appear to increase in more sprawling areas. Even when controlling for income, household size, and other variables, people drive more, have to own more cars, breathe more polluted air, face greater risk of traffic fatalities, and walk and use transit less in places with more sprawling development patterns. While these findings may seem obvious, this is the first study to explicitly measure sprawl and explicitly relate sprawl, so measured, to an important set of transportation outcomes. This study suggests that if Houston, for example, were only somewhat more compact, thousands more people would walk to work, residents would drive less, and children would breathe cleaner air.

#### Urban Sprawling leads to higher cost of transportation – turns case.

Solé-Ollé et al 7, (Albert Solé-Ollé & Miriam Hortas Rico, Profesors at Uinteversity of Barcelona and Barcelona Institute of Economics, “Does urban sprawl increase the costs of providing local public services? Evidence from Spanish municipalities”)

Given that previous empirical analyses designed to test this hypothesis are scarce –and where they do exist they focus primarily on the U.S. case–, we believe that this study of the situation in Spain can make a significant contribution to the existing literature. Here, we have examined the influence of urban sprawl on total and current spending, as well as on the six measures of spending which we consider likely to be most affected by urban sprawl (Community facilities, Basic infrastructures and transportation, Housing and community development, Local police, Culture and sports, and General administration*).* In so doing, we have estimated eight expenditure equations with the data from 2,500 municipalities for the year 2003. Urban development patterns were first measured in terms of *urbanized land,* i.e., a measure of the amount of *per capita* built-up area within each municipality. We should stress that our data were available at the local level, that is at the very level where political decisions concerning the public services analysed here are taken. In order to account for the potentially nonlinear relationship between this variable and local costs, we assumed a *piecewise linear function.* In addition to this measure, three other variables were included in the model in an attempt at providing a more accurate measurement of the scale of urban sprawl: *residential houses, % of scattered population, population centres.* Finally, we included a group of control variables so as to distinguish the effects of urban sprawl on local costs from those of other cost and demand factors. In this way, once we had controlled for a set of municipal characteristics, we were then able to determine the specific impact of sprawl on costs. Our estimation results for the control variables proved to be very similar to those obtained in previous analyses, indicating the robustness of our empirical model and, more specifically, of our urban sprawl results.

#### **Urban Sprawl costs the government more money each year**

Johnson & Wattenberg ’06 (Hans Johnson & Ben Wattenberg, CBS News & The first Measeared Century, “Environmental Literacy Council: Urban Sprawl”, <http://www.enviroliteracy.org/article.php/409.html>, 2006 DOA: 22 June 2012 JOL) Sprawl can saddle governments with the cost of building new streets and schools, while expanding utilities and other services, to connect and serve a widely dispersed, low-density population. Other critiques tend to be purely aesthetic, including the proliferation of shopping centers and other commercial development along highways that are often considered to be eyesores.

## Misc – States Solve

#### States solve for Urban Sprawl

Maya 8, (Michael M. Maya, Professor of Law at NYU, New York University Law Review: Transportation Planning and The Prevention of Urban Sprawl, <http://www.law.nyu.edu/ecm_dlv3/groups/public/@nyu_law_website__journals__law_review/documents/documents/ecm_pro_058032.pdf>)

In recent years, a number of states have passed comprehensive land use reform bills. Many of these statutes have appeared in response to the phenomenon of urban sprawl—a pattern of haphazard, automobile-dependent development on the fringes of existing cities. With rising personal incomes and persistent consumer demand for single-family homes on large lots in ethnically and physically homogeneous jurisdictions, urban sprawl has boomed. Fearful of the myriad costs of sprawl—which many commentators have chronicled—some states have acted to prevent it altogether. The most egregious costs of sprawl include the abandonment of urban centers, severe air and water pollution, and the loss of open green spaces. In economic terms, sprawl also vastly increases transportation costs for residents and workers who must travel greater distances to reach their homes, their jobs, and other destinations. Without statewide coordination, sprawl is difficult to prevent. For example, if one county prohibits the subdivision of its farmland into low-density residential lots, a neighboring county will not necessarily do the same. In fact, precisely because the restrictive county has stifled consumer demand, its neighbor may have greater incentives (in the form of spillover demand) to permit sprawling development. In addition, neither county is likely to be particularly well attuned to the negative effects of sprawl, which are often geographically and temporally dispersed and thus less salient for many local politicians. To combat these structural and political problems, some states have addressed sprawl as a matter of statewide, rather than local, concern.

# AFF ANSWERS

## Nonunqiue

#### **Urban sprawl already high – suburban expansion 10x faster – and growing (could be retagged for “UQ o/w link” arg)**

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis) sbucci

This process of suburban growth, commonly referred to as urban sprawl, n20 has become a way of life around major United States cities. Although the initial outward move from a city's central core may have been based mostly on population growth, affluence, and transportation accessibility, sprawled growth today is based largely on highway policy and unwise land use practices. n21 Suburban growth has rapidly escalated to a point where suburban inhabitants now make up over one-half of metropolitan populations. n22 Whereas new suburban rings surrounding a city used to take years to complete, suburban rings now seem to develop annually. n23 Indeed, one commentator notes that suburban growth has grown 10 times faster than the populations of urban centers, n24 and continued growth is expected for at least the next 25 years. n25

## No Link – Generic

#### **No link – planning solves it**

Maya ’08 (Michael M. Maya, New York law review, “Transportation planning and the prevention of Urban Sprawl”, <http://www.law.nyu.edu/ecm_dlv3/groups/public/@nyu_law_website__journals__law_review/documents/documents/ecm_pro_058032.pdf>, 21 May 2008 DOA: 23 June 2012 JOL)

In this Part, I lay out some of the critiques of planning and concurrency requirements. I then explain why these critiques do not defeat the need for both sets of requirements. To begin with, it is not self-evident that transportation planning and concurrency rules are the best, or even a desirable, way to reduce sprawl. Planning (in a general sense, including the timing rules contained in concurrency requirements) has definite costs that must be balanced against the practice’s usefulness in combating sprawling development. Primarily from an economic standpoint, scholars have criticized planning—and its legal embodiment, zoning 39—as an inefficient and potentially destructive departure from the Anglo-American system of common law property rights and reliance on free markets.

## No Link to HSR

#### **Link outdated – major cause now HIGHWAYS, not public transit**

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis) sbucci

This process of suburban growth, commonly referred to as urban sprawl, n20 has become a way of life around major United States cities. Although the initial outward move from a city's central core may have been based mostly on population growth, affluence, and transportation accessibility, sprawled growth today is based largely on highway policy and unwise land use practices. n21 Suburban growth has rapidly escalated to a point where suburban inhabitants now make up over one-half of metropolitan populations. n22 Whereas new suburban rings surrounding a city used to take years to complete, suburban rings now seem to develop annually. n23 Indeed, one commentator notes that suburban growth has grown 10 times faster than the populations of urban centers, n24 and continued growth is expected for at least the next 25 years. n25

## Link Turn – Generic

#### **Link Turn – Increasing public transit will actually decrease the effects of urban sprawl**

Maya, 5/21/08, Michael M. Maya, New York University School of Law, <http://www.law.nyu.edu/ecm_dlv3/groups/public/@nyu_law_website__journals__law_review/documents/documents/ecm_pro_058032.pdf>, “Transportation Planning and the Prevention of Urban Sprawl”

The regulatory schemes enacted by statewide reform acts have varied. At some point, however, policymakers have usually been compelled to consider the effects of transportation planning and policy on development patterns.14 The reasons are not hard to understand. As early as the 1970s, scholars demonstrated that low-density development could not support public transportation.15 Moreover, low-density development leads to residents traveling more than those who live in high-density areas.16 The result, in sprawling areas, is greater dependence on roads and highways, which themselves end up becoming heavily congested with private automobiles. This congestion creates demand for new roads, which then lead to even more sprawl.17 Without these roads and highways, the thinking goes, it may be possible to curtail sprawl.18 Although it would be unreasonable to dismantle roads where they already exist, this Note contends that steps can be taken to prevent new road construction, especially where development has not yet occurred. In more general terms, careful planning of transportation infrastructure may enable local governments to determine where development will take place, thereby concentrating growth in certain areas while protecting other areas from new construction. This is what I will call the “transportation planning” side of the sprawl prevention equation. The other side of the equation deals with the converse situation: Instead of roads preceding development, sometimes development precedes roads.19 19 This makes logical sense: If development never preceded roads, residents would never demand the construction of new transportation infrastructure to serve previously built-up areas or to replace (or expand) already congested arteries. Yet this happens on a regular basis. See, e.g., Rick Fink, Jr., The Widening of I-93, the Granite State Outgrows a Major Corridor, BUS. NH MAG., Jan. 1, 2003, at 34 (discussing proposal to widen Interstate 93 in New Hampshire in order to “make travel safer and less congested” and observing that “[t]he state has outgrown a stretch of the highway that continues to see rising traffic counts”). This situation is no less pernicious for states looking to prevent sprawl. If a local government allows housing to be built in a place that is underserved by existing transportation infrastructure, sooner or later political pressure will mount to provide residents of the newly developed area with better access to their homes or businesses. In sprawling areas, such access will most likely be provided in the form of new roads, not public transportation. These roads, however, will only create more traffic and lead to more sprawling development as they become just as congested as the other roads in the area.20A potential response to this dilemma is to ensure that development only occurs once adequate transportation infrastructure exists or will soon be constructed.21 I will call this the “concurrency” side of the sprawl-prevention equation. If transportation planning determines where development will occur via the location of new roads, concurrency determines when development will occur by respecting the capacity of existing roads. 20 New roads allow residents drawn by lower housing prices to move farther and farther from the urban core, thereby increasing the total amount of driving in a given metropolitan area. See ROBERT CERVERO, SUBURBAN GRIDLOCK 9–10 (1986) (noting jump in average commuting distances and suggesting that “as American cities have sprawled, so have trip patterns”). The roads themselves will soon become congested with drivers who used to travel on other roads, at other times, or by mass transit. DOWNS, supra note 3, at 27–30. The result will be demand for yet more roads, which will in turn lead to yet more sprawl.

## Sprawl Good

#### **Urban sprawl leads to multiple economics benefits.**

Kahn, 3/8/06, Matthew E. Kahn, Professor of economics @ UCLA, <http://greeneconomics.blogspot.com/2006/03/benefits-of-sprawl.html>, “The Benefits of Sprawl”

Additional Benefits of Sprawl This section briefly highlights a variety of potentially important benefits of sprawl. Data limitations preclude presenting original data analysis measuring the size of each of these effects but I believe that each contributes to household well being in sprawled cities. The Location of Employment Within the Metro Area In the year 2000, only 21% of Atlanta’s jobs were located in zip codes within 10 kilometers of the CBD. In Boston, 52% of this area’s jobs were located within 10 kilometers of the CBD (Baum-Snow and Kahn 2005). Firms gain by having the option of locating some of their employment further from the high land priced CBD. The key reasons for why firms choose particular locations include 1. land costs, 2, access to ideas, 3. access to workers and 4. transport cost savings for inputs and output. For example, manufacturing industries which are more land intensive are more likely to decentralize while skill intensive industries are less likely to decentralize (Glaeser and Kahn 2001). Those firms that gain from “Jane Jacobs” learning from other types of firms have an incentive to locate in diverse high density downtowns. Within firms, non-management occupations are increasingly being sited at the edge of major cities (Rossi-Hansberg, Sarte and Owens 2005). This cost savings increases firm profits. Firms that are able to split their activities between headquarters and production plants are likely to gain greatly from sprawl. Standard agglomeration forces encourage firms to only keep those workers at the center city headquarters who benefit from interactions in the denser downtown (Rossi-Hansberg, Sarte and Owens 2005). Other firms may gain by being able to construct large campuses where members of the firm can interact across divisions. Microsoft’s Richmond, Washington campus will be ten million square feet after it completes its expansion and there will be 12,000 workers there. Google now has 5,680 employees and is adding 1 million square feet to the 500,000 it now occupies in Mountain View, California. There are at least two quality of life benefits from employment suburbanization. The previous section documented the reduction in commute times in suburban communities as more suburbanites now live closer to their jobs rather than commuting downtown. A second quality of life benefit from suburbanized employment is that this creates a type of separation of land uses. In the past, when cities where much more compact, millions of people lived too close to dirty, noisy manufacturing and slaughterhouse activity (Melosi 2001). Declining transportation costs have allowed a separation of where goods are produced and where people live. Suburban Consumer Prices and the “Walmart” Effect Walmart and other “superstores” could not exist in an urban world of compact cities with binding zoning laws. “Wal-Mart has sometimes had difficulty in receiving planning approval for its stores. Currently, Wal-Mart has either no presence or an extremely limited presence in New England, the New York metro area, California, and the Pacific Northwest. However, its expansion into new areas has proceeded over the past few years (Hausman and Leibtag 2005).” These stores require large physical spaces and large parking lots to accommodate their inventory and to attract shoppers. Such stores offer one stop shopping and prices that can be 25% lower than regular supermarkets (see Hausman and Leibtag 2005). The diffusion of these stores may mean that the U.S consumer price index over-states inflation because this index does not properly reflect the prices that people face for core goods. These stores are disproportionately located in suburban and rural areas where land is cheap. Center city residents often drive to suburban locations to shop at such stores. While the popular media often reports stories critiquing Walmart’s employee compensation and its effects on driving out of business smaller “mom and pop” stores, it cannot be denied that consumers gain from having access to such stores. The key counter-factual here is what prices would residents face in a compact monocentric city without Walmart and other superstores

#### Urban sprawl improves minorities chance of “the American dream”

Gilroy ’01 (Leonard Gilroy, Director of Government Reform at Reason Foundation, “Urban Sprawl: Good for Minorities?” <http://reason.org/news/show/urban-sprawl-good-for-minoriti>, 26 Oct. 2001 DOA: 23 June 2012 JOL)

A recent study by Matthew Kahn at the Tufts University Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy identifies one important benefit of sprawl: it reduces the housing consumption gap between white and black Americans. Historically, there has been a gap between black and white Americans in almost every aspect of housing consumption, including homeownership rates and average housing sizes. But this gap has been closing in recent decades. Kahn found that the black/white homeownership and housing size gaps close as a metropolitan area's sprawl level—measured as the share of area jobs located outside of a 10-mile ring around the area's central business district—increases. Moreover, the study found that black households living in sprawling metropolitan areas live in larger homes, are more likely to be homeowners, and are more likely to be located in the suburbs than otherwise identical black households in less sprawled areas. Looking at the bigger picture, a recent Brookings Institution study found that racial and ethnic minorities made up over 27 percent of the total suburban population in the 102 most-populated metro areas in 2000, up substantially from 19 percent in 1990. It also found that the bulk of suburban population gains in many of those metro areas could be attributed to minorities. These figures may surprise those accustomed to thinking of the suburbs as the bastion of "white flight" émigrés. Whelan describes the black suburbanization trend succinctly: "Like whites, affluent blacks head off to the suburbs with their good fortunes." In other words, the American Dream of homeownership, backyards, good schools, and safe communities is still alive and kicking. In fact, it's within the reach of a more diverse body of people than ever before.

#### **Sprawl prevents the dangers of urban life**

Bruegmann ’07 (Robert Bruegmann, professor at the University of Illinois, “In Defense of Sprawl”, <http://www.forbes.com/2007/06/11/defense-sprawl-suburbs-biz-21cities_cx_rb_0611sprawl.html>, 11 June 2007 DOA: 23 June 2012 JOL)

Even many of the most basic facts usually heard about sprawl are just wrong. Contrary to much accepted wisdom, sprawl in the U.S. is not accelerating. It is declining in the city and suburbs as average lot sizes are becoming smaller, and relatively few really affluent people are moving to the edge. This is especially true of the lowest-density cities of the American South and West. The Los Angeles urbanized area (the U.S. Census Bureau's functional definition of the city, which includes the city center and surrounding suburban areas) has become more than 25% denser over the last 50 years, making it the densest in the country. A lack of reliable information underlies many of the complaints against sprawl. Take just one example that is considered by many the gravest charge of all: that sprawl fosters increased automobile use; longer commutes; and more congestion, carbon emissions and, ultimately, global warming. There is no reason to assume that high-density living is necessarily more sustainable or liable to damage the environment than low-density living. If everyone in the affluent West were to spread out in single-family houses across the countryside at historically low densities (and there is plenty of land to do this, even in the densest European counties), it is quite possible, with wind, solar, biomass and geothermal energy, to imagine a world in which most people could simply decouple themselves from the expensive and polluting utilities that were necessary in the old high-density industrial city. Potentially, they could collect all their own energy on-site and achieve carbon neutrality. Unless we deliberately keep most of the world's urban population in poverty, packing more people into existing cities won't solve anything. The solution is finding better sources of energy and more efficient means of doing everything. As we do this, it is quite possible that the most sustainable cities will be the least dense. Certainly sprawl has created some problems, just as every settlement pattern has. But the reason it has become the middle-class settlement pattern of choice is that it has given them much of the privacy, mobility and choice once enjoyed only by the wealthiest and most powerful. Sprawl in itself is not a bad thing. What is bad is the concept of "sprawl" itself, which by lumping together all kinds of issues, some real and important and some trivial or irrelevant, has distracted us from many real and pressing urban issues. It also provides the dangerous illusion that there is a silver bullet solution to many of the discontents created by the fast and chaotic change that has always characterized city life

#### Urbanization benefits society economically and socially

WGBIS ‘06 (WGBIS, “Urbanization – Impacts”, <http://wgbis.ces.iisc.ernet.in/energy/lake2006/programme/programme/proceedings/Presentations/Lake%202006%20-%20Presentations/28%20Dec%202006/Session%20IV/Abijith.pdf>, 20 Dec 2006 DOA: 23 June 2012 JOL)

Though urbanization has drawbacks, it has its benefits. • Efficiency - Cities are extremely efficient. Less effort is needed to supply basic amenities such as fresh water and electricity. Research and recycling programs are possible only in cities. In most cities flats are in vogue today. Many people can be accommodated within a small land area. • Convenience - Access to education, health, social services and cultural activities is readily available to people in cities than in villages. Life in cities is much more advanced, sophisticated and comfortable, compared to life in villages. Cities have advanced communication and transport networks. • Concentration of resources - Since major human settlements were established near natural resources from ancient times, a lot of resources are available in and around cities. A lot of facilities to exploit these resources also exist only in cities. • Educational facilities - Schools, colleges and universities are established in cities to develop human resources. A variety of educational courses and fields are available offering students a wide choice for their future careers. • Social integration - People of many castes and religions live and work together in cities, which creates better understanding and harmony and helps breakdown social and cultural barriers. • Improvements in economy - High-tech industries earn valuable foreign exchange and lot of money for a country in the stock markets.

#### Suburban living prevents crime and improves education for families and adults

Giammo ’11 (Thomas Giammo, Washington Post, “The benefits of suburban sprawl”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-benefits-of-suburban-sprawl/2011/12/21/gIQAxRaJEP_story.html>, 23 Dec. 2011 DOA: 23 Jun 2012 JOL)

But one must not forget that, to a segment of the population, living amid such suburban sprawl has advantages: less crime, superior schools, more personal space, etc. This is especially true for families with children. If one were to accept that the one purpose of a new highway is to increase access to the suburbs (even with no improvement in the level of traffic congestion), this accomplishment does, in fact, represent a “benefit.”