Toward the Healthy City

People, Places, and the Politics of Urban Planning

Jason Corburn

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

TOWARD THE HEALTHY CITY

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

TOWARD THE HEALTHY CITY

People, Places, and the Politics of Urban Planning

Jason Corburn

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

© 2009 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

MIT Press books may be purchased at special quantity discounts for business or sales promotional use. For information, please email special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu or write to Special Sales Department, The MIT Press, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

This book was set in Scala serif and Scala sans by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong and was printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Corburn, Jason.
Toward the healthy city : people, places, and the politics of urban planning / Jason Corburn.
p. ; cm.—(Urban and industrial environments)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-262-01331-4 (hbk. : alk. paper)—ISBN 978-0-262-51307-4 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Urban health. 2. Urban health—California—San Francisco. 3. City planning. 4. City planning—California—San Francisco. I. Title. II. Series: Urban and industrial environments.
[DNLM: 1. City Planning 2009003193 organization and administration—San Francisco. 2. Urban Health 2009003193—San Francisco. 3. Health Planning—organization and administration—San Francisco. 4. Minority Health—San Francisco. 5. Urban Renewal—organization and administration—San Francisco. WA 380 C792t 2009]
RA566.7.C673 2009
362.1′042—dc22 2009003193

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

for Azure Sky and Satya Rain

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

1 **Some Challenges for Healthy City Planning 1**

2 **Retracing the Roots of City Planning and Public Health 25**

3 **Urban Governance and Human Health 61**

4 **Toward a Politics of Healthy City Planning 83**

5 **Reframing Environmental Health Practice 103**

6 **Healthy Urban Development 129**

7 **Health Impact Assessment 163**

8 **Planning Healthy and Equitable Cities 197**

Notes 209
References 217
Index 261

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Acknowledgments

This book would not have been possible with the support and insights of Rajiv Bhatia and Lili Farhang at the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Rajiv invited me to explore the intricacies of his work and to participate in meetings and discussions at the DPH. He welcomed me into his home during my many trips from New York to San Francisco. Lili invited me to numerous internal and external meetings of the SFDPH, shared wonderful insights about their emerging practice, and helped ensure that recordings of the ENCHIA process went smoothly. Other former and current SFDPH staff, including Carolina Guzman, Fernando Ona, Cyndy Comerford Scully, Megan Gaydos, Shireen Malekafzali, and Mitch Katz, were also especially helpful and generous with their time. Oscar Grande of PODER and April Veneracion of SOMCAN offered insights about community dynamics, and April allowed me to interview her staff at length to understand SOMCAN's role in the Trinity Plaza and Rincon Hill cases. Staff at the San Francisco planning department provided data and insights about the challenges of planning practice in their city and the developing partnerships with the DPH. Juliet Ellis of Urban Habitat, Margaret Gordon of West Oakland, Victor Rubin of PolicyLink, Bob Prentice of the Public Health Institute, Tony Iton of the Alameda County Public Health Department, and Diane Aranda of The California Endowment all offered insights from their practice on healthy planning activities across the Bay Area.

The research that led to this book was made possible by the support of a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Investigator Award in Health Policy Research. I am also indebted to Bruce Link and Peter Bearman at Columbia University for providing initial seed money for the research and offering intellectual guidance and mentorship.

Most important, Judea offered moral support and understanding throughout this process and inspired me to always try and just "tell it like it is."

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

1 Some Challenges for Healthy City Planning

Urban places and the city planning processes that shape them—particularly those processes governing land use, housing, transportation, job opportunities, social services, the quality of the urban environment and opportunities for public participation in local government—are increasingly understood as powerful determinants of population health. Premature death, and unnecessary burdens of disease and suffering, are disproportionately concentrated in city neighborhoods of the poor and people of color, where residential segregation concentrates poverty, liquor stores outnumber supermarkets, toxic sites are adjacent to playgrounds, and public resources go to incarceration rather than education. While urban divestment, redlining and racist neglect were largely to blame for many urban ills and inequities of the twentieth century, city planners in the twenty-first century are increasingly faced with the added challenge of revitalizing neglected urban neighborhoods in ways that improve health and promote greater equity.

How can modern city planning, a profession that emerged in the late nineteenth century with a goal of improving the health of the least-well-off urban residents but lost this focus throughout the twentieth century, return to its health and social justice roots? What are the connections among contemporary city planning processes, not just physical outcomes, and health equity? What new political processes can help reconnect planning and public health with a focus on addressing the social determinants of health inequities in cities?

This book answers these and other questions by highlighting how public health and planning agencies along with community-based coalitions are redefining environmental health politics in cities to improve the health of people and places. Twenty-first century efforts to reconnect the fields in

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

the United States have, to date, focused on a very limited conception of healthy planning, such as how physical design changes in cities might increase physical activity and thereby improve health. This book highlights that physical changes to places without accompanying political and institutional change will ultimately fail to improve the health of disadvantaged urban populations and move urban politics toward planning more healthy and equitable cities. Further, while much contemporary research documents what's wrong with cities, particularly in poor communities of color, much less work aims to explore what political and administrative changes in municipal government can improve the well-being of people and places. *Toward the Healthy City* explores how government agencies and community coalitions in the San Francisco Bay Area are reconnecting city planning by working to change the social, scientific, and political institutions that make places and populations healthy. The book offers a new decision making framework—called healthy city planning—that address the political conditions and institutional changes that must occur in order for urban planning and public health to reconnect to promote greater health equity. Healthy city planning will require new issue and problem framings, investigative and analytic techniques, and inclusive and deliberative public processes that together can generate new norms, discourses, and practice for greater health equity. As *Toward the Healthy City* argues, healthy city planning must be viewed as healthy urban governance, where both the *substantive content* of what contributes to human well-being—the physical and social qualities that promote urban health—and the decision-making *processes and institutions* that shape the distributions of these qualities across places and populations are improved.

Unhealthy and Inequitable Cities

American cities—or more precisely certain neighborhoods in these cities—are facing a health crisis. While not a new phenomenon, the urban poor, immigrants and people of color die earlier and suffer more, by almost every measure of disease, than any population group in the United States. A sampling of evidence is as staggering as they are disturbing:

- In the New York City area, the predominantly poor, minority neighborhoods of the South Bronx, Harlem, and Central Brooklyn have rates of diabetes, asthma, mental illness, and HIV/AIDS that are nearly double that of the rest of the city (Karparti et al. 2004).

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

- In Boston's predominantly African-American and Latino Roxbury neighborhood, asthma rates between 2003 and 2005 for children under 5 were the highest in the city and more than double the citywide average (The Health of Boston 2007:35).
- The death rates from diabetes among Puerto Ricans in Humboldt Park and West Town neighborhoods of Chicago are more than twice the citywide average and 34 percent of Puerto Rican children in these neighborhoods have asthma, one of the highest rates recorded anywhere in the country (Whitman et al. 2006).
- Infant mortality for African-Americans living in the City of Compton, Los Angeles County, California, in 2004 was 17.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, the highest in the state of California and nearly two-and-a-half times greater than the rate for the United States (McCormick and Holding 2004).
- Deaths from cardiovascular disease in the predominantly African-American east side of Detroit are the highest in the city and over twice the national average (Schulz et al. 2005).
- The Bayview–Hunters Point neighborhood in San Francisco, where Latinos and African-Americans are a majority, has the highest rates of adult and pediatric asthma, adult diabetes, and congestive heart failure in the entire city (BHSF 2007).

What explains these disturbing and, as I will show in subsequent chapters, persistent but avoidable patterns of death and disease? Public health has a history of searching for the one "big cause" or explanation for differences in health outcomes across populations, from nineteenth-century theories of miasma and contagion to medical care and genetic explanations of the twenty-first century. Yet urban health researchers and professionals are increasingly exploring how a combination of place-based physical, economic and social characteristics and the public policies and institutions that shape them—not genetics, lifestyles or health care—are the cause of inequitable distributions of well-being in cities. For example, Adam Karpati, assistant commissioner of the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, noted in testimony to the New York City Council that the concentration of health disparities in poor, African-American and Latino neighborhoods are not likely due to disparities in access to health care, risky individual lifestyles, or genetic differences, but that:

> They are due primarily to differences in the social, economic, and physical conditions in which people live and the health behavior patterns that arise in these

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

settings. "Health disparities" are more than "health-care disparities" . . . one lesson from the health data is that disparities exist for almost every condition. This observation suggests that, regardless of the specific issue, poor health shares common root causes. It is important to remember, then, that strategies aimed at particular issues need to be complemented by attention to those root causes of poor health: poverty, discrimination, poor housing, and other social inequities. Fundamentally, *eliminating health disparities is about social justice*, which is the underlying philosophy of public health. (Emphasis added; Karpati 2004)

Toward the Healthy City explores how city planning processes can address the "root causes" of health inequities.[1] I reveal how urban governance practices can alter the social determinants of health (SDOH), including the quality of employment and educational opportunities, affordable housing, access to healthy food, transit that serves a range a users, safe spaces for social interaction, and toxic-free environments, all fundamental drivers of health inequities according to the World Health Organization (WHO 2008). This book explores a new political framework that could improve upon and extend in new ways current efforts to address urban health inequities (Barton and Tsourou 2000; Diez-Roux 2001; Duhl and Sanchez 1999; Fitzpatrick and LaGory 2000; Freudenberg et al. 2006; Frumkin et al. 2004; Geronimus 2000; Kawachi and Berkman 2003).

City Planning as Urban Governance

Planning practice as conceived in this book is about the processes, institutions, and discourses that generate the physical plans and interventions that shape cities. While the everyday practice of city planning has some formal rules, such as drafting land use plans and including the public in environmental review processes, planners regularly have to make discretionary decisions that shape the content and direction of these processes. These discretionary decisions include such subjective judgments as how much information to release to the public, the selection of the consultant team that often performs analyses, the standards of acceptable evidence and norms of inquiry in review processes, which interest groups to invite to public processes, and how participatory processes will adjudicate disputes and reach agreement (Friedman 1987; Forester 1999). These decisions have a significant influence over the content and outcomes of planning processes, such as whether they do or do not respond to claims of bias, discrimination and inequality. Importantly, the politics of planning in America is also shaped by "planners"—from the private sector to

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

community members—that sit outside of governmental planning agencies. Public–private planning partnerships, autonomous public authorities managing ports and airports, quasi-public redevelopment corporations, nonprofit community development corporations, and the privatized traditional public services in cities have all blurred the boundaries between public, private, and community planning and the political alliances and interests of "planners" (Fishman 2000; Graham and Marvin 2001; Harvey 1989). Thus I view urban planning as simultaneously about the micro-politics of cities—or the day-to-day negotiations over development and management decisions (Majone 1989)—and the macro-politics of cities—or conflicts about how different political ideologies ought to shape the place-based goals and outcomes of planning processes (Hajer 2001).

This micro and macro conception of the politics of planning remains controversial among theorists but suggests that planning practice ought to be considered an essential part of urban governance (Fainstein 2000; Yiftachel and Huxley 2000). Just as the spheres of political, economic, and social life overlap in the activities of everyday lives, the term governance as used here emphasizes the interactions, relations, and meaning-making that occurs as organizations attempt to influence collective action (Cars et al. 2002; Young 1996). Governance is not just about government, it is also about the struggles and conflicts between formal institutions and organizations and informal norms and practices, and how actors use both formal and informal processes to shape public decisions.[2] Urban governance includes a complex mix of different contexts, actors, arenas, and issues, where struggles over power are exposed in public discourses or embedded in tacit day-to-day routines. While I expand on the idea of planning as urban governance in later chapters, I use the term here to make explicit the political conditions that can lead planners to use or abuse power, respond to or even resist market forces, work to empower some groups and dis-empower others, promote multi-party consensual decision making or simply rationalize decisions already made (Forester 1999).

Public Health Promotion in the City

By public health I refer to the public policies, practices, and processes that influence the distribution of disease, death, and well-being for populations, or what the field generally calls health promotion. Similar to my view of planning, the work of public health is often framed as occurring in both

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

formal governmental institutions and informal governance processes. For example, the US Institute of Medicine's (1988:7) definition of public health states that the profession aims to fulfill:

> society's interest in assuring the conditions in which people can be healthy . . . It links many disciplines and rests upon the scientific core of epidemiology. . . . [T]he committee defines the organizational framework of public health to encompass both activities undertaken within the formal structure of government and the associated efforts of private and voluntary organizations and individuals.

Also similar to my view of city planning, public health should be viewed as an ongoing practice, not "merely the absence of disease or infirmity," as the World Health Organization so articulately stated over half a century ago (WHO 1948). The 1986 Ottawa Charter for health promotion further clarified that health is a "resource for everyday life, not the objective of living" and "is a positive concept emphasizing social and personal resources, as well as physical capacities" (WHO 1986). Health promotion, the WHO has repeatedly emphasized, cannot be achieved by the health sector alone but also demands coordinated action across non–health policy areas of government, such as social, economic, service, and environmental sectors, along with participation by nongovernmental organizations, industry, and the media (WHO 2008).

Building on the International Healthy City Movement

This book builds on and explores ways to extend the work of the international healthy cities movement that originated in the European offices of the World Health Organization (WHO 1988). Early leaders of the international healthy city movement were Trevor Hancock and Leonard Duhl (1988), who suggested that the healthy city is a place that is continually creating and improving the physical, social, and political environments and expanding the community resources that enable individuals and groups to support each other in performing all the functions of life and in developing themselves to their maximum potential. Hancock and Duhl (1988:23) go on to note:

> [W]e must develop and incorporate into our assessment of the health of a city a variety of unconventional, intuitive and holistic measures to supplement the hard data. Indeed, unless data are turned into stories that can be understood by all, they are not effective in any process of change, either political or administrative.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

I will highlight how "planners" in the United States are employing new norms, analytic tools, and decision-making processes to capture some of these qualities of the healthy city. Drawing from the analytic criteria of the WHO for healthy cities, I show how contemporary healthy planning work in the United States is extending these international ideas. Despite barriers of earlier practices, opportunities exist for implementing healthy urban environments whose characteristics can exceed the ideal principles outlined by the WHO (as shown in the sidebars below and next page).

This book differs from and extends the work of the international healthy cities movement in some important ways. First, the WHO healthy cities program has not emphasized the combination of policy processes, science norms, and organizational network building that might contribute to healthy urban development and city planning more generally (Tankano 2003:5). Second, after two decades, the World Health Organization's healthy cities program in Europe has only had limited success integrating analyses of problems that might be driving health inequities in cities with developing healthy urban plans and implementing these plans (De Leeuw and Skovgaard 2005). Third, evaluations of the European healthy cities

WHO Characteristics of a Healthy City

- A clean, safe physical environment of a high quality (including housing quality)
- An ecosystem that is stable now and sustainable in the long term
- A strong mutually supportive and nonexploitative community
- A high degree of participation, and control, by the citizens over the decisions affecting their lives, health, and well-being
- The meeting of basic needs (food, water, shelter, income, safety, and work) for all the city's people
- Access by the people to a wide variety of experiences and resources, with the chance for a wide variety of contact, interaction, and communication
- A diverse, vital, and innovative economy
- The encouragement of connectedness with the past, with the cultural and biological heritage of city dwellers, and with other groups and individuals
- A form that is compatible with and enhances the preceding characteristics
- An optimum level of appropriate public health and sickness care services, accessible to all
- High health status (high levels of positive health and low levels of disease)

Source: World Health Organization (1995).

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

WHO Principles for Developing a Healthy Cities Project

- **Equity** All people must have the right and the opportunity to realize their full potential in health.
- **Health promotion** A city health plan should aim to promote health by using the principles outlined in the Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (Annex 1): build healthy public policy; create supportive environments; strengthen community action and develop personal skills; and reorient health services.
- **Intersectoral action** Health is created in the setting of everyday life and is influenced by the actions and decisions of most sectors of a community.
- **Community participation** Informed, motivated and actively participating communities are key elements for setting priorities and making and implementing decisions.
- **Supportive environments** A city health plan should address the creation of supportive physical and social environments. This includes issues of ecology and sustainability as well as social networks, transportation, housing and other environmental concerns.
- **Accountability** Decisions of politicians, senior executives and managers in all sectors have an impact on the conditions that influence health, and responsibility for such decisions should be made explicit in a clear and understandable manner and in a form that can be measured and assessed after time.
- **Right to peace** Peace is a fundamental prerequisite for health and the attainment of peace is a justifiable aim for those who are seeking to achieve the maximum state of health for their community and citizens.

Source: World Health Organization (1997).

program have not suggested if the growth of cities participating in the movement—from a handful to over 1,500—has altered regional urban management, development, and planning decisions.

Yet, important for the analytic framework offered in this book, the WHO healthy cities program in Europe has developed a set of evaluative categories that recognize the need for political and institutional change in order to move toward the healthy city. The WHO framework, called "Monitoring, Accountability, Reporting, and Impact assessment" or MARI, recognizes that healthy cities must be simultaneously attentive to changes in the underlying principles behind a healthy city, involve new actors, draft new policies, and identify and implement new methods of monitoring and evaluating procedural and health outcome changes (De Leeuw 2001).

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Healthy City Designation Requirements: Selections of the WHO European Regional Office

- Healthy cities must have in place mechanisms that ensure an integrative approach to health planning, with links being made between their health policies and other key citywide strategies.
- Particular emphasis should be placed on the three issues of (1) reducing inequalities in health, (2) working to achieve social development, and (3) commitment to sustainable development.
- Cities should demonstrate increased public participation in the decision-making processes that affect health in the city, thereby contributing to the empowerment of local people.
- Cities should implement an ongoing program of training/capacity building activities for health and healthy public policy making; this program should have two strands: involving key decision makers across different sectors in the city, and involving local communities and opinion leaders.
- Cities must produce and implement a city health development plan.
- Cities should implement a program of systematic health monitoring and evaluation, integrated with the city health development plan, to assess the health, environmental, and social impacts of policies within the city.
- Cities should implement and evaluate a comprehensive program of activity to address at least one of the following priority topics: social exclusion, healthy settings, healthy transport, children, older people, additions, civil and domestic violence, accidents.

Source: De Leeuw (2001:43–44).

A selection of criteria from the MARI framework used by the WHO to designate healthy cities suggest that the healthy city is not a static condition nor a limited set of health outcome measures but rather a commitment to continually improving the well-being of populations, places, and policy-making processes with an explicit emphasis on reducing health inequities (see the sidebar above).

Science and the Healthy City

A crucial aspect of healthy city planning, and one often overlooked or viewed uncritically by both urban planning and public health scholars, is the appropriate role for science and technology. As my historical review in chapter 2 considers in more detail, science and technology were often viewed by urban developers, governments, and researchers as tools to

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

simultaneously improve the qualities of places and change the unhealthy behaviors of individuals. I show how this view of science, often labeled "moral environmentalism," has not only regularly failed to improve the health of the least well off places and population groups in cities but also acted to further alienate disadvantaged groups from processes of science and how they can influence urban governance.

Toward the Healthy City argues that science has encoded ways of knowing and acting in both urban planning and public health and that these embedded practices are some of the most significant barriers for moving toward more healthy and equitable cities. For example, I will trace the connections between city planners and public health professionals when the city was viewed as a *field site*—where a preexisting reality was discovered by surveyors, ethnographers, and residents who developed a keen personal sensitivity to the uniquely revealing features of their particular place. This was the dominant "science of the city" during the American Sanitary and Progressive eras, and local institutions such as Settlement Houses and neighborhood health centers helped craft policy responses. However, as germ theory, bacteriology, and the biomedical model set in, a new urban health science emerged—*the city as a laboratory*. The laboratory view of the city realigned urban policies to reflect legitimacy in laboratory settings, where findings and interventions could be applied anywhere and to all population groups because they reflected the placeless, standardized, and controlled environment of the ideal laboratory. The context-specific polices during the city as field site era were largely replaced by universal, nonspecific interventions, such as chemical treatment of drinking water and childhood immunizations administered by centralized and specialized bureaucracies. *Toward the Healthy City* offers a critical examination of how scientific views of the city have not only separated planning and public health but have shaped the analytic and political processes that underwrite city governance today. I argue that new orientations toward science are needed to help bridge the "two cultures" of the laboratory and field site views in order to promote greater health equity in cities (Snow 1962).

Moving toward healthy city planning will require a recasting of science and expertise, similar to calls for a new science in order to address the urgent issues of climate change and sustainability (Cash et al. 2003; Lubchenco 1998). This new "paradigm" calls for a shift away from experimental science driven from inside existing disciplines by scientists working alone to a view of scientific practice that is more dispersed, context-dependent, and problem-oriented (Nowotny et al. 2001). I will show that

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

the science underwriting the healthy city is inherently political; its facts are uncertain, values in dispute, stakes high, and decisions urgent—all contributing to what Funtowicz and Ravetz (1993) have called postnormal science.[3] In postnormal conditions science crosses disciplinary lines, enters into previously unknown investigative territories, requires the deployment of new methods, instruments, protocols, and experimental systems, and involves politically sensitive processes and results. This book highlights that legitimate science for healthy city planning must be co-produced, where researchers, government agencies, and lay publics engage in polycentric, interactive, and multipartite public sharing of information (Jasanoff 2004). *Toward the Healthy City* explores how this view of science might be applied in governance practices, from new research partnerships that redefine environmental health to the development of healthy city indicators for assessing and monitoring urban planning decisions.

Toward a Politics of Healthy Planning: Populations, Places, Processes, and Power

Toward the Healthy City begins by examining the historical connections and disconnects between city planning and public health in order to highlight some of the unaddressed political challenges facing contemporary efforts to reconnect the fields. Addressing the disconnects between the fields of planning and public health is essential not only for improving local governance but also for understanding and addressing global political change. For example, in 2001 the UN Centre on Human Settlements (Habitat) (UNCHS 2001:1) stated in their *State of Cities* report that cities are where they expect the solutions to society's most pressing problems to emerge:

> For better or worse, the development of contemporary societies will depend largely on understanding and managing the growth of cities. The city will increasingly become the test bed for the adequacy of political institutions, for the performance of government agencies, and for the effectiveness of programmes to combat social exclusion, to protect and repair the environment and to promote human development.

Once viewed as sites of parochial and even xenophobic policy making, local governments are increasingly being recognized as sites of progressive reform and innovation (Appadurai 2001; Fung 2006).

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Table 1.1
Political frames for healthy city planning

Population health	▪ Emphasizes distribution of health inequities across groups ▪ Targets social determinants of health, not individual behaviors, genetics or health care
Places	▪ Defined as the combination of physical, social, and material characteristics, the institutions and policies that shape them, and the attributions of meaning to these qualities ▪ A relational view investigates the interactions among the multiple characteristics and the contestations over assigned meaning and their interpretations
Processes	▪ Governance as the formal and informal organizations and practices that shape collective action ▪ Exploring the mechanisms for how social inequities get "embodied"
Power	▪ Fundamental to shaping and reshaping of cities ▪ Power over and with are possible, and often expressed in norms of expertise, structural racism, and condoning of white privilege

A new set of political frames are necessary for moving toward a new practice of healthy city planning. As Shon and Rein (1994) note, *how* policy issues are framed from the outset affects the quality of solutions; defined too narrowly or too broadly, public policy solutions will suffer from the same defects. The frames for moving toward healthy city planning include considerations of population health, a relational view of place, processes of governance, and relations of power (see table 1.1).

Population Health

While the term "population" can imply something different in the fields of demography, geography, and urban studies, population health is concerned with assessing and addressing why some social groups are healthier than others while paying attention to how social inequalities determine health inequities (Evans and Stoddart 1990). Two central questions in population health are "what explains the *distribution* of disease and well-being across populations" and "what drives current and changing patterns of inequalities in well-being across population groups?" By emphasizing *distribution* as distinct from *causation*, population health investigates how social, political, and economic forces—from racism, to economic policies,

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

to neighborhood environments—shape which groups get sick, die earlier, and suffer unnecessarily.

Population health focuses on changing the *social determinants of health* (SDOH) defined by the World Health Organization (Wilkinson and Marmot 2003) as "the causes of the causes." The SDOH include the positive and negative influences that explain population well-being, including the social gradient (or the idea that the further down one sits in the social ladder, the shorter is life expectancy and the greater is incidence of disease); stress; early-life support; educational status; employment, working conditions and unemployment; and access to food, housing transportation, and health services; income; social exclusion and social support (Raphael 2006; WHO 2008). A population health approach is thus not limited to so-called proximal or "downstream" (i.e., closer to the individual and assumed greater causal strength for explaining disease) risk factors such as smoking or physical activity. Nor does a population health approach, as used in this book, focus exclusively on the distal or "upstream" (i.e., father from the body and assumed to be a less potent causal explanation) social structures, processes, and distributions of power that are blamed for perpetuating inequality and health disparities (Yen and Syme 1999).[4] Healthy city planning must embrace a view of population health that treats the proximate/downstream and distal/upstream dichotomy as problematic and instead seeks to identify what combination of forces—political, social, economic, biologic, and so forth—in certain places are likely driving population distributions of death and disease and what policy interventions might alter these forces (Krieger 2008).

Place, in a Relational View

A central feature of population health, and one that differentiates it from other models of public health, is that context and features of the built and social environments are understood as key drivers of well-being, not merely the background for other mechanisms driving morbidity and mortality to take place. The influence of place, neighborhood, or context is increasingly recognized as major, if not the most important, determinant of human well-being (Cummins et al. 2005; Diez-Roux 2001, 2002; Frumkin 2005; Geronimus 2000; Hood 2005; Macintyre et al. 2002). Urban place characteristics, such as affordable housing, access to healthy food, employment opportunities, quality education, public transportation, social networks, and cultural expression, are social determinants of health and so fall within the domain of many urban governance processes (Burris et al. 2007). Yet

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

the role of place in urban planning and policy remains controversial, particularly in debates over whether place-based policies can address urban and regional inequality (Dreier et al. 2004; Hayden 1997; Harloe et al. 1990; Logan and Molotch 1987; Orfield 1997).

The second policy frame for healthy city planning demands not only taking place seriously, but viewing place characteristics *relationally*. A relational view of place emphasizes that the physical and social characteristics in spaces matter for well-being, but these features cannot be separated from the meanings that people in different places assign to these characteristics. In other words, the interactive processes of assigning meaning to a place, and these meanings themselves, are crucial aspects of thinking and acting relationally about how places engender health or distribute premature morbidity and mortality (Gieryn 2000; Graham and Healey 1999; Jackson 1994; Whyte 1980).

Therefore, as I argue in this book, healthy places ought to be understood as being doubly constructed; physically (the buildings, streets, parks, etc., often termed the "built environment") and socially (through the assigning of meanings, interpretations, and narratives as well as the construction of networks, institutions and process to shape these meanings and outcomes). This relational view highlights the processes that simultaneously connect the material, social, and political and ultimately turn a physical spot in the universe into *a place*. Yet the social and political processes behind the construction of place-based meanings are often contested and almost always contingent. A crucial aspect of healthy place-making is creating forums for ongoing public discourse that allows for debate over existing meanings and the construction of new meanings, particularly as demographics change. By taking a relational view of places, healthy city planning processes can help reveal the often hidden relations of power and inequality that are manifested in the physical, material, and social characteristics of places (Emirbayer 1997; Escobar 2001).[5]

Importantly the relational view of places aims to shift research and practice away from a conceptualization of places as a set of quantitative variables that act as static covariates in regression models (Diez Roux 1998, 2001; Duncan and Jones 1993; Ewing et al. 2003; Frank et al. 2006; Handy et al. 2002). Defining place characteristics as only static variables obscures the subjective meanings people assign to the features in the places where they live, work, pray and play—such as a "relaxing park," "safe street," and "good school." One dangerous result of research that limits analyses of place and health to quantitative methods alone is that the selected variables

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

must show a statistically significant "place effect" on well-being (usually health outcomes), or the study may wrongly conclude that individual biology, behaviors or genes—not some aspect of place—are to blame for health status. A similar weakness of variable-centered studies of place and health is that a positive finding, such as a statistical correlation between physical characteristics of neighborhoods and health outcomes, may lead to overly physically deterministic conclusions, such as the idea that the presence or absence of a park, bicycle lane, or grocery store is the primary determinant for why nearby populations are or are not physically active or eat healthy foods. A relational view aims to act as an alternative to these framings of place by emphasizing the mutually reinforcing relationships between places, people, and meaning-making, on the one hand, and the political institutions and processes that shape these relationships, on the other (Cummins et al. 2007).

Processes for the Healthy City

A third policy frame for healthy city planning aims to move practice beyond a focus on people and places by emphasizing the processes, here called urban governance, that shape health promoting opportunities for people and place-based characteristics. Urban policy making has long debated whether to focus *either* on improving opportunities for individuals or the qualities of places (Bolton 1992). Implicit within the people-based versus place-based policy debate is the idea that a conflict exists between two possible goals of policy: improving the welfare of people as individuals, *regardless of where they live*, and improving the welfare of groups by improving qualities of their place. Education, job and family assistance, Section 8 housing subsidies, family relocation programs, and certain types of health care assistance form the core of people-based policy approaches, while strategies aimed at improving infrastructure, building affordable housing, and issuing neighborhood block grants are examples of place-based policies. In a world of limited resources, people-based and place-based policies are often pitted against one another.

Toward the Healthy City extends this discourse by emphasizing that not only are policies focused on people and place important for healthy cities, but that greater attention needs to be paid to the institutional processes that shape these policies. Institutions are not just the formal structures or procedures of government but rather an established way of addressing certain social issues, such as norms of practice, that become "taken for granted" and accepted over time (Healey 1999). One process dimension

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

for healthy city planning is the meaning-making described above. A second process, also mentioned earlier, is that of science. As I will show throughout this book, reconnecting planning and public health will require processes of analysis that are "trans-disciplinary," or a science that opens up the boundaries of existing fields and disciplines, notions of expertise, and the legitimate participants for shaping science policy. The institutionalist view examines when established processes, such environmental impact assessment, or new processes, such as health impact assessment, might best promote the goals of healthy city planning.

A third process aspect of healthy city planning is for practitioners to more clearly articulate the processes through which they think the characteristics of places get "embodied" (Krieger and Davey Smith 2004). The notion of the bodily imprint of social conditions was powerfully expressed in 1844 by Friedrich Engels in *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, where he observed how the sufferings of children working in wretched conditions were "indelibly stamped" on adults. Geronimus (2000) argues that chronic discrimination, stress, and exposure to home, neighborhood, and workplace hazards results in a persistent "weathering" on the bodies of the poor and people of color that denigrates the immune, metabolic, and cardiovascular systems and fuels infectious and chronic disease. Nancy Krieger (2005:350) claims that our "bodies tell stories about—and cannot be studied divorced from—the conditions of our existence." The implication for healthy and equitable city planning is that practitioners will need to critically engage with how history leaves a biologic imprint on populations through processes of embodiment; investigating these mechanisms is crucial, since our bodies can often "tell stories that people cannot or will not tell, either because they are unable, forbidden, or choose not to tell" (Krieger 2005: 350).

Power and Health Equity

The fourth policy frame for moving *Toward the Healthy City* is to address power inequalities in cities and across metropolitan regions more generally. Questions of who has power, where it derives from, how it is deployed, and to what ends are seminal in urban politics (Banfield 1961; Dahl 1961; Domhoff 1986; Dreier et al 2004; Mollenkopf 1983; Stone 2004). Power in healthy city planning includes the ability to affect institutional, disciplinary, and bureaucratic changes. While the elite, pro-growth coalition articulated by Logan and Molotch (1987) has tended to dominate analyses of urban political power, De Leon (1992) and others have highlighted how

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

organized coalitions have resisted "growth machines" to promote a more progressive urban politics. Power relationships can enable or place constraints on group and individual abilities to resist exposures to material and social health hazards.

Power also operates in urban politics to keep certain issues and interests off the political agenda (Lukes 2005). For instance, scientific knowledge often acts as a powerful discourse of exclusion and to mask the political and social dimensions of policy issues (Hacking 1999; Jasanoff 2004). Claims of expertise act as a form of power, such as when scientists prematurely minimize potential uncertainties surrounding an issue in order to help shape and legitimize political decisions (Wynne 2003). While experts are expected to play an increasing role in shaping science-based policy decisions—including those of healthy city planning—the rules for demarcating who is "expert enough" to participate in these processes are almost entirely unwritten, open to wide bureaucratic judgment, and, as I will show, reveal entrenched power struggles over urban governance.

Any effort to improve the quality of life in American cities must also address the power inequities perpetuated by structural racism and white privilege (Massey and Denton 1993; Greenberg and Schneider 1994; Wacquant 1993). The origins of urban inequality cannot be divorced from structural racism, such as federal housing policies that not only denied home ownership to urban African-Americans but physically destroyed many predominantly black neighborhoods under the guise of urban renewal (Ford 1994; Sugrue 1996; Wallace and Wallace 1998; Williams and Collins 2001). Moving *Toward the Healthy City* requires that practitioners address the combinations of policies, institutional practices, cultural representations, and other norms that perpetuate racial group inequity and allow for privileges associated with "whiteness" (Aspen Institute 2004; Bonilla-Silva 1997; Ford 1994).[6]

Healthy City Planning in the San Francisco Bay Area

Toward the Healthy City explores how these political frames can shape a new practice of healthy city planning through a series of case studies from the San Francisco Bay Area[7], where governmental agencies, community organizations, researchers, and others have experimented with new city and regional land use policies aimed at promoting health equity. The city and county of San Francisco and the entire Bay Area is an ideal site to investigate the politics of healthy city planning because the region is

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

struggling to address the forces that contribute to social and health inequities in many postindustrial urban areas, including a decline of affordable housing, hyperresidential segregation, loss of low-skilled well-paying jobs, regional land use sprawl, and neighborhood-scale inequalities of access to transit, supermarkets, open space, and other health-promoting amenities. Yet, at the same time, local governments and civic organizations across the region often innovate with environmental health and social policies that act as models for future state, national, and in some cases, international policy action. For example, the cities in the Bay Area spurred the banning of lead in gasoline and legislated the nation's first Sustainability Plan and Precautionary Principle ordinance. The city of San Francisco has banned the sale of cigarettes in retail pharmacies, has the nation's most ambitious urban recycling, composting and "zero–solid waste" programs, and was the first to attempt to provide universal health care to its residents (Knight 2008).

Studying population health in the Bay Area is also important because, perhaps surprisingly, the region is one of the least healthy metropolitan areas in the United States. For example, a study tracking the progress of the 100 largest US cities toward achieving the goals of *Healthy People 2010*, San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose (three of the Bay Area's largest cities) ranked in the bottom quintile—below New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, and Atlanta (Duchon, Andruis, and Reid 2004). Health inequities also plague San Francisco's neighborhoods. For example, African-Americans in San Francisco lose more years of life to just about every possible cause of death than city residents of other racial backgrounds (Aragón et al. 2007). The infant mortality rate for African-American San Franciscans is 11.6 per 1,000 live births, compared to 2.8 for whites and 4.1 for the city as a whole (BHSF 2004). Over 16 percent of African-American babies born in San Francisco have low birth weights, compared to 6.2 percent for whites and 7.4 percent for the city as a whole. Nearly 17 percent of the population in the largely African-American and Latino community of Bayview–Hunters Point has been hospitalized for adult diabetes and the Tenderloin neighborhood, where two-thirds of the population are people of color, ranks second behind Bayview for incidence of chronic disease (BHSF 2007). The South of Market area (SoMa), where over half the population is Latino and Asian, has the highest rates of mental illness in the city of San Francisco (BHSF 2007).

Another objective for looking in-depth at urban governance in one region is to provide the "thick description" that can highlight the distinctive needs

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

and place qualities that can help planning practices promote health equity. While many studies of the connections between land use planning and heath aim to identify “best practices,” or the possibility of melioration through imitation, the cases in this book emphasize that practitioners should engage with the cultural specificities of places and not aim for one-size-fits-all interventions. By exploring the political and cultural challenges for healthy city planning in the San Francisco Bay Area, the cases presented in this book offer analysis and comparison within and across a complex metropolitan region, noting the forces that may be unique to the area and those that can contribute to healthy planning in cities everywhere.

The Cases

Toward the Healthy City is structured around three cases detailing how government agencies, community activists, researchers, and others in San Francisco and across the Bay Area have attempted to practice healthy city planning. Each case describes how traditional planning issues, such as housing development, a neighborhood rezoning plan, the environmental impact assessment process, and drafting a general plan, were reframed as health and justice issues, the influence this reframing had on institutional practices, and how the process outcomes are expected to promote health equity. The cases were selected because they each highlight one or more crucial aspects of the politics of healthy city planning, from how urban issues and problems get redefined as health equity issues, to how new institutional practices across disciplines and agencies are organized, to the gathering and public justification of the new evidence base used to support healthy city planning practices. The cases also highlight that healthy city planning is not one but a set of diverse practices that are more likely to emerge from the work of community-based organizations and public health departments than planning agencies. Each case explores why this might be so and highlights the barriers and opportunities for reconnecting city planning and public health in the San Francisco Bay Area. The cases include the reframing of environmental health practice, healthy urban development, and using health impact assessment for urban and regional planning.

Reframing Environmental Health

In the Bayview–Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco, where environmental justice activists have worked for decades to get government

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

agencies to address toxic exposures and health issues in their community, activists were instrumental in helping to reframe environmental health practice in the city. Local activists partnered with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH), Environmental Health Section, to explore the relationships between disease and pollution. The partnership conducted a community health survey, and to the surprise of the agency, the survey revealed that the most important environmental health issues for community members were violence, access to healthy food, and affordable housing—not pollution. The partnership lead to new projects and programs within the SFDPH to address community concerns, including a project focused on addressing the multiple determinants of food insecurity in Bayview. This chapter explores why and how this shift occurred within the SFDPH, and investigates how local and international social movements came together to alter health promotion strategies across the entire agency. I detail both the forces that gave rise to the reframing of environmental health and the new practices that embody the new definition. The case also highlights the political conditions that enabled the new definition of environmental health to spread to non–health focused organizations, particularly the city planning department and community-based activist groups.

Healthy Urban Development

The second case explores how the new environmental health orientation of the San Francisco Department of Public Health was applied to urban development projects. In one project, the Trinity Plaza redevelopment, the developer planned to demolish the rent-controlled building and build a market-rate condominium in its place. At the urging of a coalition of community-based organizations called the Mission Anti-displacement Coalition, that had worked for years to stop rapid gentrification and rising property values during the 1990s dotcom boom, the SFDPH analyzed the likely human health impacts of the residential displacement and unaffordable housing from the Trinity Plaza project. The analysis was submitted as part of the project's environmental impact report, and the case follows the debates between the planning and health agencies over whether the health impacts of housing and related social determinants of health fall within the purview of environmental assessment. In a second development project, the Rincon Hill Area Plan, new high-rise condominiums and high-end retail stores were planned in the low-income South of Market area (SoMa) of San Francisco. Activists and the city's Planning Department

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

again asked the health agency to analyze the "environmental impacts" from the project. The health agency noted the positive and negative social determinants of health that would likely result from the project, including creating new jobs, concentrating residential segregation by building affordable units off-site and straining existing capacity of local schools, transit and parks. While both projects were approved, each included alterations to mitigate likely health impacts, such as guaranteeing that all affordable units in the Trinity Plaza case would be preserved and, in the Rincon Hill project, the developer agreed to pay an impact fee to support a community benefit fund controlled by local organizations. The case study examines how a health agency participated in the planning process for the first time, made the case for the direct and indirect health impacts of urban development and altered the environmental review process to include health analyses. The chapter highlights key political questions for healthy city planning, such as when and how to use existing planning processes to promote health equity, the role for community planning in promoting healthy development, and the institutional challenges for reconnecting the municipal bureaucracies of public health and planning?

Health Impact Assessment for Urban and Regional Planning

The third case explores the first participatory health assessment of a land use planning issue in San Francisco, called the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Health Impact Assessment (ENCHIA), and how this process helped stimulate the institutionalization of health impact assessment in planning practices across the entire San Francisco Bay Area. The ENCHIA involved over twenty-five different public agencies and nongovernmental organizations and was organized by the SFDPH to allow these groups to collaboratively evaluate the positive and negative impacts of a rezoning plan. The process developed a collective vision of the healthy city, selected indicators to attach to the vision, gathered and spatially analyzed new data to measure the indicators, and combined these data into a land use and health screening tool called the Healthy Development Measurement Tool (HDMT). The case study explores the inner workings of the ENCHIA, including how the process was designed and managed, the products it produced, and how conflicts over the content and direction of the process were handled? I also examine how the ENCHIA has influenced healthy planning practices across the Bay Area metropolitan region. The chapter examines the forces that enable healthy city planning to become healthy regional governance, such as new coalitions involving governmental and

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

nongovernmental organizations and the construction of new networks for monitoring healthy planning activities that can hold governments and the private sector accountable.

Research Methods

The cases offered here draw from four years of research from 2004 to 2008, including interviews, participant observation in public meetings and within city agencies, and reviews of original documents. The San Francisco Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Section, gave me access to scores of documents for each case, including written reports, original data, and confidential emails and meeting notes. The health agency also provided me with the opportunity to follow the work of the ENCHIA from its inception to conclusion, where I attended tens of meetings, regularly interviewed participants, and observed internal agency meetings within the San Francisco Department of Public Health. I also performed three evaluations of the ENCHIA, two during the process and one at its conclusion. These evaluations included confidential face-to-face and telephone interviews with over forty participants and in one case, a written survey instrument. I also audio recorded each ENCHIA meeting and generated transcripts of the dialogues. All these data—the interviews, surveys and meeting transcripts—aided in my reconstruction of all the cases, since many of the ENCHIA participants were also involved in the other cases presented here. The cases also reflect in-depth interviews with staff from many of the community-based organizations involved in each of the cases presented here and staff in the San Francisco Planning Department. Finally, I performed content analyses of media coverage for each of the cases in an effort to understand how outside observers were characterizing the events behind each case.

Outline of the Book

In the next chapter, I offer a critical review of the histories of modern American city planning and public health from the late nineteenth century through the dawn of the twenty-first century. I observe that both fields emerged with similar concerns of improving the health of the least-well-off urban populations, and this helped connect their work as each field aimed to address infectious disease through new sanitary, housing, and social programs. However, work in the fields diverges by the turn of the twentieth

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

century, and with a few exceptions the professions of city planning and public health continue to move further apart for the next one hundred years. I trace the policies, programs and science behind this disconnect through five eras: (1) 1850s to 1900s, miasma and the sanitary city; (2) 1910s to 1920s, germ theory and the rational city; (3) 1930s to 1950s, the biomedical model and the pathogenic city; (4) 1960s to 1980s, crisis and the activist city; and (5) 1990s to 2000s, social epidemiology and the resilient city. The chapter emphasizes that five interrelated themes acted to separate the fields and move each away from their social justice roots: (1) reaction to health and urban crises by removing and displacing people and physical blight; (2) reliance on technical rationality and biomedical science; (3) moral environmentalism or the belief that rational physical designs could change social conditions for the poor; (4) scientific representations of the city as laboratory rather than a field site; and (5) increased professionalization, bureaucratic fragmentation, and specialized expertise. The chapter concludes by suggesting that these themes remain encoded in the institutions of planning and public health and that contemporary efforts aimed at healthy city planning must find ways to overcome these challenges and reconnect with the social justice roots of the fields.

In chapter 3, I show how contemporary city planning processes typically fail to address the social determinants of health and thus help perpetuate health inequities in cities. Using the example of the environmental impact assessment process, I suggest how planning processes might engage with the social determinants of health and review the range of ways human health is positively and negatively influenced by planning practices. I go beyond the usual focus on the outcomes of planning practice, such as transportation systems, housing, and different land uses, to consider how planning processes contribute to human health outcomes.

In chapter 4, I offer a framework for responding to the political and institutional challenges outlined in chapter 2 and the adverse health outcomes described in chapter 3. I consider a set of alternative issue framings that build on the political conditions for healthy city planning outlined in the introduction—namely population health, the relational view of place, governance processes, and an attention to power. The issue frames include moving from (1) reaction to crises with strategies of removal to promoting health through precaution and prevention; (2) a reliance on scientific rationality to the co-production of scientific and political knowledge; (3) physical determinism to a relational view of places, where physical and social

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

characteristics, along with the meanings assigned to places are the focus of analysis and policy; (4) views of the city as laboratory to embracing the field site and population health view of cities; and (5) professionalization, bureaucratic fragmentation, and specialization to building new regional policy and health equity monitoring networks. I use these new issue frames to help analyze the case studies of healthy city planning experiments in the San Francisco Bay Area.

In chapter 5, I present the first case study and reveal how environmental health was reframed to embrace the social determinants of health equity. In chapters 6 and 7, I analyze the political conditions that enable or stymie implementation of the healthy city planning framework from the neighborhood to the regional scale.

In the concluding chapter 8, I draw the key lessons for planning and urban policy making from the case studies. I return to the analytic framework outlined in chapter 4 and evaluate the extent to which the cases pursued these political conditions, what additional factors beyond the framework are necessary to promote healthy and equitable planning, and the general policy lessons suggested by the framework and the case studies. I emphasize that the politics of healthy city planning is an ongoing practice that must engage with the emerging science of the social determinants of health while also learning by doing in collaborations among government agencies, community groups, scientists, and others. I end the book with recommendations for urban planners, public health professionals, and community members seeking to plan more healthy and equitable cities.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

References

Abrams, C. 1955. *Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing*. New York: Harper.

Abramson, M., and the Young Lords Party. 1971. *Palante: Young Lords Party*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Acevedo-Garcia, D., and Lochner, K. 2003. Residential segregation and health. In Kawachi, I., and Berkman, L., eds., *Neighborhoods and Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 265–87.

Acheson, D., Barker, D., Chambers, J., Graham, H., Marmot, M., and Whitehead, M. 1998. *The Report of the Independent Inquiry into Health Inequalities*. London: Stationary Office. http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/doh/ih/contents.htm.

Addy, C., Wilson, D., Kirtland, K. A., Ainsworth, B. E., Sharp, P., and Kimsey, D. 2004. Associations of perceived social and physical environmental supports with physical activity and walking behavior. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(3): 440–43.

Adler, N. E., and Newman, K. 2002. Socioeconomic disparities in health: Pathways and policies. *Health Affairs* 21(2): 60–76.

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). 2005. *National Healthcare Disparities Report*. AHRQ Publication 05-0014. http://www.ahrq.gov/QUAL/nhdr04/nhdr04.htm.

Agnew, J. A., and Duncan, J. S. 1989. *The Power of Place: Bringing Together Geographical and Sociological Imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Aicher, J. 1998. *Designing Healthy Cities: Prescriptions, Principles and Practice*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Alameda County. 2005. Department of Public Health, *Community Information Book Update*, October. http://www.acphd.org/User/data/datareports.asp.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Alejandrino, S. V. 2000. *Gentrification in San Francisco's Mission District: Indicators and Policy Recommendations*. A report prepared for the Mission Economic Development Association, San Francisco. http://www.medasf.org.

Altschuler, A., Somkin, C. P., and Adler, N. E. 2004. Local services and amenities, neighborhood social capital, and health. *Social Science and Medicine* 59, 1219–29.

American Public Health Association (APHA). 1938. *Basic Principles of Healthful Housing*. Committee on the Hygiene of Housing. Chicago: Public Administration Service.

American Public Health Association (APHA). 1948. *Planning the Neighborhood: Standards for Healthful Housing*. Committee on the Hygiene of Housing. Chicago: Public Administration Service.

Anderson, M., and Cook, J. 1999. Community food security: Practice in need of theory? *Agriculture and Human Values* 16: 141–50.

Appadurai, A. 2001. Deep democracy: Urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and Urbanization* 13: 23–43.

Aragón, T. J., Lichtensztajn, D. Y., Katcher, B. S., Reiter, R., and Katz, M. H. 2007. *Calculating Expected Years of Life Lost to Rank the Leading Causes of Premature Death in San Francisco*. San Francisco Department of Public Health. www.sfdph.org.

Aranda, D. 2008. Personal communication.

Argyris, C., and Schön, D. 1996. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Ashton, J., ed. 1992. *Healthy Cities*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Aspen Institute. 2004. *Structural Racism and Community Building*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

Babcock, R. F. 1966. *The Zoning Game: Municipal Practices and Policies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Baer, N. 2007. Manager of injury prevention and physical activity promotion projects, Contra Costa Health Services. Personal communication.

Bajaj, V., and Story, L. 2008. Mortgage crisis spreads past subprime loans. *New York Times*. February 12. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/12/business/12credit.html.

Bamberger, L. 1966. Health care and poverty: What are the dimensions of the problem from the community's point of view? *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 42: 1140–49.

Banerjee, T., and Baer, W. C. 1984. *Beyond the Neighborhood Unit: Residential Environments and Public Policy*. New York: Plenum.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Banfield, E. 1961. *Political Influence*. New York: Free Press.

Barnes, R., and Scott-Samuel, A. 2002. Health impact assessment and inequalities. Pan *American Journal of Public Health* 11(5–6): 449–53.

Bartlett, R. V. 1997. The rationality and logic of NEPA revisited. In Clark, R., and Canter, L., eds., *Environmental Policy and NEPA: Past, Present and Future*. Boca Raton, FL: St. Lucie Press, pp. 51–60.

Barton, H., and Tsourou, C. 2000. *Healthy Urban Planning*. London: Spon Press.

Bashir, S. A. 2002. Home is where the harm is: Inadequate housing as a public health crisis. *American Journal of Public Health* 92(5): 733–38.

Bauer, C. 1945. Good neighborhoods. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 242: 104–15.

Baum, H. 2004. Smart growth and school reform: What if we talked about race and took community seriously? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(1): 14–26.

Bay Area Alliance. 2004. State of the Bay. *A Regional Report. Bay Area Indicators. Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities and Northern California Council for the Community*. http://www.bayareaalliance.org/publications.html.

Bay Area Economics. 2006. *Presentation, The Richmond Economy*. www.cityofrichmondgeneralplan.org/docManager/1000000297/BAE%20Ec%20Background%20Report%20EDC%209-13-06.pdf.

Bay Area Regional Health Inequalities Initiative (BARHII). 2007. www.barhii.org.

Bay Area Working Group on the Precautionary Principle (BAWG). 2006. www.takingprecaution.org/index.html.

Bayview Hunters Point, Health and Environmental Assessment Task Force (BVHP HEAP). 2001. *Community Survey*. http://www.dph.sf.ca.us/Reports/BayviewHlthRpt09192006.pdf.

Belussi, F. 1996. Local systems, industrial districts and institutional networks: Towards a new evolutionary paradigm of industrial economics? *European Planning Studies* 4(3): 5–26.

Benveniste, G. 1989. *Mastering the Politics of Planning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berkman, L., and Kawachi, I., eds. 2000. *Social Epidemiology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berry, F. S., and Berry, W. D. 1999. Innovation and diffusion models in policy research. In Sabatier, P., ed., *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 169–200.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Besser, L., and Dannenberg, A. 2005. Walking to public transit: Steps to help meet physical activity recommendations. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 29(4): 273–80.

Bhatia, R., and Katz, M. 2001. Estimation of health benefits from a local living wage ordinance. *American Journal of Public Health* 91(9): 1398–1402.

Bhatia, R. 2003. Swimming upstream in a swift current: Public health institutions and inequality. In Hofricter, R., ed., *Health and Social Justice: Politics, Ideology, and Inequity in the Distribution and Disease*. San Francisco: Jossy-Bass, pp. 557–78.

Bhatia, R. 2005, 2006, 2007. Director, Environmental Health, San Francisco Department of Public Health. Personal communication.

Birley, M. H. 1995. *The Health Impact Assessment of Development Projects*. London: HMSO.

Black, K., and Cho, R. 2004. *New Beginnings: The Need for Supportive Housing for Previously Incarcerated People*. New York: Coalition for Supportive Housing and Common Ground.

Bloomberg, M. 2003. *Mayor's Management Report, Fiscal Year 2003*. New York: Office of the Mayor.

Blumenfeld, J. 2003. New approaches to safeguarding the Earth: An environmental version of the Hippocratic Oath. San Francisco Chronicle Open Forum. August 4.

Bobo, K., Kendall, J., and Max, S. 1996. *Organizing for Social Change: A Manual for Activists in the 1990s*. Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks.

Bolen, E. 2003. *Neighborhood Groceries: New Access to Healthy Food in Low-Income Communities*. San Francisco: California Food Policy Advocates.

Bolton, R. 1992. "Place prosperity vs prosperity" revisited: An old issue with a new angle. *Urban Studies* 29: 185–203.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 1997. Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review* 62: 465–80.

Booth, C. 1902. *Life and Labour of the People in London*. New York: Macmillan.

Borsook, P. 1999. How the Internet ruined San Francisco. *Salon Magazine*. www.salon.com/news/feature/1999/10/28/internet/print.html.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boyer, C. 1983. *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Brahinsky, R. 2005. Housing for whom? Looming plans to reshape the eastern half of the city could alter the city's socioeconomic balance. *San Francisco Bay Guardian* 39: 32.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Brandt, A. 1987. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States since 1880*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brazil, E. 1998. S.F. housing a story of endless shortage. *San Francisco Examiner* July, 28.

Brenner, N. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

British Medical Association (BMA). 1998. *Health and Environmental Impact Assessment: An Integrated Approach*. www.bma.org.uk/ap.nsf/Content/Healthenvironmentalimpact~Recommendations.

Broussard, A. S. 1993. Black San Francisco: The Struggle for Racial Equality in the West, 1900–1954. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Brown, B., and Campell, R. 2005. *Smoothing the Path from Prison to Home*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice. www.vera.org/publication_pdf/319_590.pdf.

Building a Healthier San Francisco (BHSF). 2004. *Community Health Assessment, San Francisco*. Northern California Council for the Community. www.hcncc.org/Upload/2004_Building_Healthier_SF_Needs_Assessment.pdf.

Building a Healthier San Francisco (BHSF). 2007. *Community Health Assessment, San Francisco*. http://www.healthmattersinsf.org/index.php?module=htmlpages&func=display&pid=29.

Bullard, R., ed. 2007. *Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice, and Regional Equity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bullard, R. 1994. *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Bullard, R. D., and Johnson, G. S. 2000. Environmental justice: Grassroots activism and its impact on public policy decision making. *Journal of Social Issues* 56: 555–78.

Burris, S., Hancock, T., Lin, V., and Herzog, A. 2007. Emerging strategies for healthy urban governance. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 84(1): 154–63.

Burrows, E. G., and Wallace, M. 1999. *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*. New York: Oxford University Press.

California Environmental Health Tracking Program (CEHTP). 2006. *Community Perspective on Environmental Health Tracking*. West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project-Indicators Study. www.neip.org.

California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2004. *Intra-agency Environmental Justice Strategy*. August. Sacramento: CALEPA.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2005. *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. Sacramento: California Air Resources Board.

California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2007. *Precautionary Approaches Guidance Development Update*. Draft Work Plan. April 16.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 1998. *Appendix G, Checklist*. http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/Appendix_G.html.

California, State of. 2006. *General Plan Guidance*. Office of Planning and Research. http://www.opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=planning/gpg.html.

California, State of. 2007. *School Physical Fitness Test Report, 2006–07*. Sacramento.

Carroll, M. 2006. City set to end wrangling over Trinity Plaza with OK on deal. *San Francisco Examiner*, August 3. www.examiner.com/a-203469~City_set_to_end_wrangling_over_Trinity_Plaza_with_OK_on_deal.html?cid=rss-San_Francisco.

Cars, G., Healey, P., Madanipour, A., and De Magalhaes, C. 2002. *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity and Social Milieux*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Carson, M. 1990. *Settlement Folk: Social Thought and the American Settlement Movement, 1885–1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carson, R. 1962. *Silent Spring*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Case, A., Fertig, A., and Paxson, C. 2005. The lasting impact of childhood health and circumstance. *Journal of Health Economics* 24(2): 365–89.

Cash, D. W., Clark, W. C., Alcock, F., Dickson, N. M., Eckley, N., Guston, D. H., Jager, J., and Mitchell, R. B. 2003. Knowledge systems for sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA* 100: 8086–91.

Castells, M. 1983. The city and the grassroots: A cross-cultural theory of urban social movements. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2004. *Designing and Building Healthy Places*. http://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces.

Chadwick, E. 1842. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Chion, M. 2005. Former director of Community and Environmental Planning, San Francisco Department of City Planning. Personal communication.

Chu, A., Thorne, A., and Guite, H. 2004. The impact of mental well-being of the urban and physical environment: An assessment of the evidence. *Journal of Mental Health Promotion* 3(2): 17–32.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Clancy, K. 2004. Potential contributions of planning to community food systems. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22: 435–38.

Clark, K. 1965. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York: Harper.

Clark, W. C., Crutzen, P. J., and Schellnhuber, H. J. 2005. Science for global sustainability: Toward a new paradigm. Working paper 120. Center for International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Clarke, A. 2005. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cleary, S. 2007. Project manager, Urban Habitat. Personal communication.

Cohen, S. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Cole, B. L., Willhelm, M., Long, P. V., Fielding, J. E., Kominski, G., and Morgenstern, H. 2004. Prospects for health impact assessment in the United States: New and improved environmental impact assessment or something different? *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 29(6): 1153–86.

Cole, B. L., Shimkhada, R., Fielding, J. E., Kominski, G., and Morgernstern, H. 2005. Methodologies for realizing the potential of health impact assessment. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 28: 382–89.

Cole, L. 1994. The struggle of Kettleman City: Lessons for the movement. *Maryland Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 5: 67–80.

Collins, J. 2006, 2007. SOMCAN organizer. Personal communication.

Collins, J. W. Jr., David, R. J., Handler, A., Wall, S., and Andes, S. 2004. Very low birthweight in African American infants: The role of maternal exposure to interpersonal racial discrimination. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(12): 2132–38.

Commission of the European Communities. 2000. *Communication from the Commission on the Precautionary Principle*. COM(2000) 1. Brussels. http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/health_consumer/library/pub/pub07_en.pdf.

Cone, M. 2005. Europe's rules forcing U.S. firms to clean up; unwilling to surrender sales, companies struggle to meet the EU's tough stand on toxics. *Los Angeles Times*, May 16, p. A1.

Conklin, T. J., Lincoln, T., and Flanigan, T. P. 1998. A public health model to connect correctional health care with communities. *American Journal of Public Health* 88(8): 1249–50.

Conley, D., and Bennett, N. G. 2000. Is biology destiny? Birth weight and life chances. *American Sociological Review* 65: 458–67.

Contra Costa County. 2005. *Community Health Indicators for Selected Cities and Places in Contra Costa County*. Hospital Council Report, March 3.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Cooper, R., and David, R. 1986. The biologic concept of race and its application to public health and epidemiology. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 11: 97–116.

Cooper, R. S., Kaufman, J. S., and Ward, R. 2003. Race and genomics. *New England Journal of Medicine* 348(12): 1166–70.

Corburn, J. 2003. Bringing local knowledge into environmental decision-making: Improving urban planning for communities at risk. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22: 420–33.

Corburn, J. 2004. Confronting the Challenges in reconnecting urban planning and public health. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(4): 541–46.

Corburn, J. 2005. *Street Science: Community Knowledge and Environmental Health Justice*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997a. *The National Environmental Policy Act: A Study of Its Effectiveness after Twenty-five Years*. Washington, DC: CEQ.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997b. *Environmental Justice Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act*. www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/policies/ej/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf.

Cronon, W. 1992. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: Norton.

Cummins, S., Curtis, S., Diez-Roux, A. V., and Macintyre, S. 2007. Understanding and representing "place" in health research: A relational approach. *Social Science and Medicine* 65: 1825–38.

Cummins, S., and Macintyre, S. 2005. Food environments and obesity—Neighborhood or nation? *International Journal of Epidemiology* 35: 100–104.

Cummins, S., Stafford, M., Macintyre, S., Marmot, M., and Ellaway, A. 2005. Neighborhood environment and its association with self-rated health: Evidence from Scotland and England. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 59: 207–31.

Cunningham, G., and Michael, Y. 2004. Concepts guiding the study of the impact of the built environment on physical activity for older adults: A review of the literature. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 18(6): 435–43.

Curtis, S. E. 1990. Use of survey data and small area statistics to assess the link between individual morbidity and neighborhood deprivation. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 44: 62–68.

Dafoe, J. 2007. Green collar jobs in New York City. *Urban Agenda*. http://www.urbanagenda.org/projects.htm#growing.

Dahl, R. 1961. *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Daily, G. C., Alexander, S., Ehrlich, P. R., Goulder, L., Lubchenco, J., Matson, P. A., Mooney, H. A., Postel, S., Schneider, S. H., Tilman, D., and Woodwell, G. M. 1997. Ecosystem services: Benefits supplied to human societies by natural ecosystems. *Issues in Ecology* 1(2): 1–18.

Daniels, R. 1997. No lamps were lit for them: Angel Island and the historiography of Asian American immigration. *Journal of American Ethnic History* 17: 2–18.

Dannenberg, A., Bhatia, R., Cole, B., Heaton, S., Feldman, J., and Rutt, C. 2008. Use of health impact assessment in the United States: 27 Case studies, 1999–2007. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 34: 241–56.

Dannenberg, A. L., Bhatia, R., Cole, B. L., Dora, C., Fielding, J. E., Kraft, K., McClymont-Peace, D., Mindell, J., Onyekere, C., Roberts, J. A., Ross, C. L., Rutt, C. D., Scott-Samuel, A., and Tilson, H. H. 2006. Growing the field of health impact assessment in the United States: An agenda for research and practice. *American Journal of Public Health* 96: 262–70.

Dannenberg, A. L., Jackson, R. J., Frumkin, H., Schieber, R. A., Pratt, M., Kochtitzky, C., and Tilson, H. H. 2003. The impact of community design and land-use choices on public health: A scientific research agenda. *American Journal of Public Health* 93: 1500–1508.

Davenport, C., Mathers, J., and Parry, J. 2005. Use of health impact assessment in incorporating health considerations in decision making. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60: 196–201.

Davey-Smith, G. 2000. Learning to live with complexity: Ethnicity, socioeconomic position, and health in Britain and the United States. *American Journal of Public Health* 90: 1694–98.

De Leeuw, E., and Skovgaard, T. 2005. Utility-driven evidence for healthy cities: Problems with evidence generation and application. *Social Science and Medicine* 61: 1331–41.

De Leeuw, E. 1999. Healthy Cities: Urban social entrepreneurship for health. *Health Promotion International* 14: 261–69.

De Leeuw, E. 2001. Global and local (glocal) health the WHO healthy cities program. *Global Change and Human Health* 2: 34–45.

De Vries, S., Verheij, R., Groenewegen, P., and Spreeuwenberg, P. 2002. Natural environments–healthy environments? An exploratory analysis of the relationship between greenspace and health. *Environment and Planning* A35: 1717–31.

Deegan, M. J. 2002. *Race, Hull House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience against Ancients Evils*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

DeLeon, R. E. 1992. *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975–1991*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1996. *Expanding Housing Choices for HUD-Assisted Families*. First Biennial Report to Congress: Moving to Opportunity Fair Housing Demonstration. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research. April.

Di Chiro, G. 1996. Nature as community: The convergence of environment and social justice. In Cronon, W., ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York: Norton, pp. 298–320.

Diez-Roux, A. V., Merkin, S. S., Arnett, D., Chambless, L., Massing, M., Nieto, F. J., Sorlie, P., Szklo, M., Tyroler, H. A., and Watson, R. L. 2001. Neighborhood of residence and incidence of coronary heart disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 345: 99–106.

Diez-Roux, A. 2000. Multilevel analysis in public health research. *Annual Review of Public Health* 21: 171–92.

Diez-Roux, A. V., Nieto, J., Muntaner, C., Tyroler, H. A., Comstock, G. W., Shahar, E., Cooper, L. S., Watson, R. L., and Szklo, M. 1997. Neighborhood environments and coronary heart disease. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 146: 48–63.

Diez-Roux, A. V. 1998. Bringing context back into epidemiology: Variables and fallacies in multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* 88: 287–93.

Diez-Roux, A. V. 2001. Investigating neighborhood and area effects on health. *American Journal of Public Health* 91: 1808–14.

Diez-Roux, A. V. 2002. Places, people, and health. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 155: 516–19.

Domhoff, G. W. 1986. The growth machine and the power elite: A challenge to pluralists and Marxists alike. In Waste, R., ed., *Community Power: Directions for Future Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 53–75.

Dora, C., and Phillips, M. 1999. *Transport, Environment, and Health: Reviews of Evidence for Relationships between Transport and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Dreier, P., Mollenkopf, J., and Swanstrom, T. 2004. *Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-first Century*, 2nd ed. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

DuBois, W. E. B., ed. 1906. *The Health and Physique of the Negro American*. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press. Reprinted 2003 in the *American Journal of Public Health* 93: 272–76.

Duchon, L. M., Andrulis, D. P., and Reid, H. M. 2004. Measuring progress in meeting healthy people goals for low birth weight and infant mortality among the 100 largest cities and their suburbs. *Journal of Urban Health* 81: 323–39.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Duffy, J. 1990. *The Sanitarians: A History of American Public Health*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Duggan, T. 2004. Bringing healthy produce to poor neighborhoods. *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 16. http://temp.sfgov.org/sfenvironment/articles_pr/2004/article/071604.htm.

Duhl, L., ed. 1963. *The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Duhl, L. J., and Sanchez, A. K. 1999. *Healthy Cities and the City Planning Process*. http://www.who.dk/document/e67843.pdf.

Duncan, C., and Jones, K. 1993. Do places matter? A multi-level analysis of regional variation in health related behaviour in Britain. *Social Science and Medicine* 37: 725–33.

Durazo, C. 2005. South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN). Personal communication.

Ecob, R., and Macintyre, S. 2000. Small area variations in health-related behaviors: Do these depend on the behavior itself, its measurement, or on personal characteristics? *Health and Place* 6: 261–74.

Edquist, C. 2001. Innovation policy—A systemic approach. In Archibugi, D., and Lundvall, B.-Å., eds., *The Globalizing Learning Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 219–38.

Edsall, T. B., and Edsall, M. D. 1991. *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics*. New York: Norton.

Ellen, I. G., Dillman, K., and Mijanovich, T. 2001. Neighborhood effects on health: Exploring the links and assessing the evidence. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23: 391–408.

Ellen, I. G., and Turner, M. A. 1997. Does neighborhood matter? Assessing recent evidence. *Housing Policy Debate* 8: 833–66.

Emirbayer, M. 1997. Manifesto for a relational sociology. *American Journal of Sociology* 103: 281–317.

Engels, F. [1844] 1968. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Henderson, W. O., and Chaloner, W. H., trans./eds. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Epstein, E. 1999. Money changing everything in the Mission. *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 18, p. A17.

Escobar, A. 2001. Culture sits in places: Reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography* 20: 139–74.

Eslinger, B. 2006. SF plans green community. *The Examiner*, August 12.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Etzkowitz, H., and Leydesdorff, L. 2000. The dynamics of innovation: From national system and "mode 2" to a triple helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy* 29: 109–23.

Evans, P. B., ed. 2002. *Livable Cities? Urban Struggles for Livelihood and Sustainability*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Evans, R. G., and Stoddart, G. L. 1990. Producing health, consuming health care. *Social Science and Medicine* 31: 1347–63.

Evans, R., Barer, M., and Marmor, T. 1994. *The Determinants of Health of Populations*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Ewing, R., Schmid, T., Killingsworth, R., Zlot, A., and Raudenbush, S. 2003. Relationship between urban sprawl and physical activity, obesity, and morbidity. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 18: 47–57.

Exline, S. 2006. San Francisco Department of City Planning. Personal Communication.

Fagan, J., and Davies, G. 2004. The natural history of neighborhood violence. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 20(2): 127–47.

Fainstein, S. 2005. Planning theory and the city. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25: 121–30.

Fairfield, J. D. 1994. The scientific management of urban space: Professional city planning and the legacy of progressive reform. *Journal of Urban History* 20: 179–204.

Farhang, L. 2006, 2007. Personal communication.

Farhang, L., Bhatia, R., Comerford Scully, C., Corburn, J., Gaydos, M., and Malekafzali, S. 2008. Creating tools for healthy development: Case study of San Francisco's Eastern Neighborhoods Community Health Impact Assessment. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 14(3): 255–65.

Farmer, P. 1999. *Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feagin, J. R. 2000. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge Press.

Federal Housing Authority (FHA). 1936. *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*. Technical Bulletin 5. July 1. Washington, DC: FHA.

Feenstra, G. 1997. Local food systems and sustainable communities. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 12(1): 28–36.

Feldman, C. 2000. MAC Attack. Anti-displacement group puts planning commission on the defensive. *San Francisco Bay Guardian*, September 13.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Fischer, C., Leydesdorff, L., and Schophaus, M. 2004. Science shops in Europe: The public as stakeholder. *Science and Public Policy* 31(3): 199–211.

Fischler, R. 1998. For a genealogy of planning. *Planning Perspectives* 13(4): 389–410.

Fisher, I. D. 1986. *Frederick Law Olmsted and the City Planning Movement in the United States*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

Fishman, R., ed. 2000. *The American Planning Tradition: Culture and Policy*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Fitzpatrick, K., and LaGory, M. 2000. *Unhealthy Places: The Ecology of Risk in the Urban Landscape*. London: Routledge.

Flournoy, R., and Treuhaft, S. 2005. *Healthy Food, HealthyCommunities: Improving Access and Opportunities through Food Retailing. Policylink and The California Endowment*. www.policylink.org/pdfs/HealthyFoodHealthyCommunities.pdf.

Fone, D., and Dunstan, F. 2006. Mental health, places and people: A multilevel analysis of economic inactivity and social deprivation. *Health and Place* 12(3): 332–44.

Food Trust, The. 2004. *Farmer's Market Program Evaluation*. www.thefoodtrust.org/catalog/resource.detail.php?product_id=68.

Ford, G. B. 1915. The city scientific. *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference in City Planning,* Boston: National Conference on City Planning, pp. 31–39.

Ford, R. T. 1994. The boundaries of race: Political geography in legal analysis. *Harvard Law Review* 107: 1844–1921.

Forester, J. 1999. *The Deliberative Practitioner*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Foster, S. 1999. Impact assessment. In Gerrard, M., ed., *The Law of Environmental Justice*. Chicago: American Bar Association, pp. 256–306.

Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Fox, D. M., Jackson, R. J., and Jeremiah, A. B. 2003. Health and the built environment. *Journal of Urban Health* 80(4): 534–35.

Frank, L. D., Sallis, J. F., Conway, T. L., Chapman, J. E., Saelens, B. E., and Bachman, W. 2006. Many pathways from land use to health: Associations between neighborhood walkability and active transportation, body mass index, and air quality. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72(1): 75–87.

Freudenberg, N. 2001. Jails, prisons and the health of urban populations: A review of the impact of the correctional system on community health. *Journal of Urban Health* 78: 214–35.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Freudenberg, N., Galea, S., and Vlahov, D., eds. 2006. *Cities and the Health of the Public*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Fried, J. P. 1976. City's housing administrator proposes "planned shrinkage" of some slums. *New York Times*, February 3, p. A1.

Frieden, B. 1979. *The Environmental Protection Hustle*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Friedman, D. J., Hunter, E. L., and Parrish, R. G. 2002. *Shaping a Vision of Health Statistics for the 21st Century*. National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics. http://www.ncvhs.hhs.gov/hsvision/visiondocuments.html.

Friedmann, J. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frug, G. E. 1999. *City Making: Building Communities without Building Walls*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frumkin, H. 2001. Beyond toxicity: The greening of environmental health. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 20: 234–40.

Frumkin, H. 2002. Urban sprawl and public health. *Public Health Reports* 117: 201–17.

Frumkin, H. 2003. Healthy places: Exploring the evidence. *American Journal of Public Health* 93: 1451–56.

Frumkin, H. 2005. Health, equity, and the built environment. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 113: A290–91.

Frumkin, H., Frank, L., and Jackson, R. J. 2004. *Urban Sprawl and Public Health*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Fulbright, L. 2006. Big victory for Hunters Point activists: As PG&E closes its old, smoky power plant, the neighborhood breathes a sigh of relief. *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 15, p. A1.

Fullilove, M. 2006. Personal communication.

Fullilove, M. T. 2003. Neighborhoods and infectious disease. In Kawachi, I., and Berkman, L. F., eds., *Neighborhoods and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 211–23.

Fullilove, M. T. 2004. *Root Shock: How Tearing up City Neighborhoods Hurts America and What We Can Do about It*. New York: Ballantine.

Fullilove, M. T., and Fullilove, R. E. 2000. What's housing got to do with it? *American Journal of Public Health* 90: 183–84.

Fung, A. 2006. *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Funtowitcz, S., and Ravetz, J. R. 1993. Science for the post-normal age. *Futures* 25(7): 739–59.

Gagen, E. A. 2000. Playing the part: Performing gender in America's playgrounds. In Holloway, S. L., and Valentine, G., eds., *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*. London: Routledge, pp. 213–29.

Galea, S., and Vlahov, D. 2005. *Handbook of Urban Health: Populations, Methods, and Practice*. New York: Springer.

Galea, S., Freudenberg, N., and Vlahov, D. 2005. Cities and population health. *Social Science and Medicine* 60: 1017–33.

Galobardes, B., Lynch, J. W., and Davey Smith, G. 2004. Childhood socioeconomic circumstances and cause-specific mortality in adulthood: Systematic review and interpretation. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 26: 7–21.

Gans, H. 1967. *The Levittowners*. New York: Pantheon.

Garrett, L. 2000. *Betrayal of Trust: The Collapse of Global Public Health*. New York: Hyperion.

Gaventa, J. 1980. *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Gee, G., and Takeuchi, D. 2004. Traffic stress, vehicular burden and well-being: A multilevel analysis. *Social Science and Medicine* 59: 405–14.

Gee, G. C., and Payne-Sturges, D. C. 2004. Environmental health disparities: A framework integrating psychosocial and environmental concepts. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 112: 1645–53.

Gelobter, M. 2006. Personal communication.

Geronimus, A. T., and Thompson, J. P. 2004. To denigrate, ignore, or disrupt: The health impact of policy-induced breakdown of urban African American communities of support. *Du Bois Review* 1(2): 247–79.

Geronimus, A. T. 1994. The weathering hypothesis and the health of African American women and infants: Implications for reproductive strategies and policy analysis. In Sen, G., and Snow, R. C., eds., *Power and Decision: The Social Control of Reproduction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Geronimus, A. T. 2000. To mitigate, resist, or undo: Addressing structural influences on the health of urban populations. *American Journal of Public Health* 90: 867–72.

Ghosh, A. 2005. San Francisco Department of City Planning. Personal communication.

Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Gieryn, T. F. 1999. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gieryn, T. 2000. A place for space in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 463–96.

Gieryn, T. 2006. City as truth-spot: Laboratories and field-sites in urban studies. *Social Studies of Science* 36(1): 5–38.

Gilens, M. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gillette Jr., H. 1983. The evolution of neighborhood planning: From the Progressive Era to the 1949 Housing Act. *Journal of Urban History* 9(4): 421–44.

Glaser, E., Davis, M. M., and Aragón, T. 1998. *Cancer Incidence among Residents of the Bayview–Hunters Point Neighborhood, San Francisco, California, 1993–1995*. Sacramento: California Department of Health Services.

Goodman, A. H. 2000. Why genes don't count (for racial differences in health). *American Journal of Public Health*, 90, pp. 1699–1702.

Goodman, R. 1971. *After the Planners*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Goodno, J. B. 2004. Feet to the fire. *Planning* 70(4): 14–19.

Goodyear, C. 2005a. Deal protests tenants of Trinity Plaza apartments. *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 15, p. B4.

Goodyear, C. 2005b. Rincon Hill's huge towers put on hold. *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 8, p. A1.

Gordon, M. 2007. West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project. Personal communication.

Gottlieb, R. 1993. *Forcing the Spring. The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Graham, S., and Marvin, S. 2001. *Splintering Urbanism*. New York: Routledge.

Graham, S., and Healey, P. 1999. Relational concepts of space and place: Issues for planning theory and practice. *European Planning Studies* 7: 623–46.

Grande, O. 2005. People Organized for the Defense of Economic and Environmental Rights (PODER). Personal Communication.

Granovetter, M. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 81: 1287–1303.

Greenberg, M., and Schneider, D. 1994. Violence in American cities: Young black males is the answer, but what was the question? *Social Science and Medicine* 39(2): 179–87.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Greenberg, M. 1991. American Cities: Good and bad news about public health. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 67: 17–21.

Greenhouse, S. 2001. Hispanic workers die at higher rates. *New York Times*, July 16, p. A11.

Grey, M. 1999. *New Deal Medicine: The Rural Health Programs of the Farm Security Administration*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gross, J., LeRoy, G., and Janis-Aparicio, M. 2002. Community benefit agreements: Making development projects accountable. California: Good Jobs First and the California Public Subsidies Project.

Gunder, M. 2006. Sustainability: Planning's saving grace or road to perdition? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26: 208–21.

Haar, C. M., and Kayden, J. S., eds. 1989. *Zoning and the American Dream: Promises Still to Keep*. Chicago: Planners Press.

Haber, S. 1964. *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Habermas, J. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hacking, I. 1999. *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Haines, M. R. 2001. The urban mortality transition in the United States, 1800–1940. NBER Historical Paper 134. http://www.nber.org/papers/h0134.pdf.

Hajer, M. 2001. The need to zoom out: Understanding planning processes in a post-corporatist society. In Madanipour, A., Hull, A., and Healey, P., eds., *The Governance of Place: Space and Planning Processes*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 178–202.

Hall, P. 1996. *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hall, T., and Hubbard, P. 1998. *The Entrepreneurial City*. Chichester: Wiley.

Hamilton, A. 1943. *Exploring the Dangerous Trades: The Autobiography of Alice Hamilton*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Hamilton, D. C., and Hamilton, C. V. 1997. *The Dual Agenda: The African American Struggle for Civil and Economic Equality*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hancock, T. 1993. The evolution, impact, and significance of the healthy cities/communities movement. *Journal of Public Health Policy* (spring): 5–18.

Hancock, T., and Duhl, L. 1988. *Promoting Health in the Urban Context*. World Health Organization, Healthy Cities Papers. Copenhagen: FADL Publishers.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Handy, S. L., Boarnet, M. G., Ewing, R., and Killingsworth, R. E. 2002. How the built environment affects physical activity: Views from urban planning. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 23(suppl 2): 64–73.

Harloe, M., Pickvance, C. G., and Urry, J., eds. 1990. *Place, Policy, and Politics: Do Localities Matter?* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Harrington, M. 1962. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.

Harrison, P. M., and Karberg, J. C. 2004. Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2003. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin* NCJ 203947: 1–14.

Hartig, T., and Lawrence, R. J. 2003. The residential environment and health. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(3): 455–73.

Hartman, C. 2002. *City for Sale: The Transformation of San Francisco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harvey, D. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, P. 1989. From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation of urban politics in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler* B71(1): 3–18.

Hayden, D. 1997. *Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Healey, P. 1998. Building institutional capacity through collaborative approaches to urban planning. *Environment and Planning* A30(5): 1531–56.

Healey, P. 1999. Institutionalist analysis, communicative planning and shaping places. *Journal of Planning and Environment Research* 19(2): 111–22.

Healey, P. 2003. Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory* 2(2): 101–23.

Healey, P. 2007. *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for Our Times*. London: Routledge.

Health Canada. 1986. *Achieving Health for All: A Framework for Health Promotion*. http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hcs-sss/pubs/care-soins/1986-frame-plan-promotion/index_e.html.

Hinkle, L. E., and Loring, W. C., eds. 1977. *The Effect of the Manmade Environment on Health and Behavior*. CDC 77-8318. Atlanta, GA: US Public Health Service.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Hirsh, A. R. 1983. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940–1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoch, C. 1994. *What Planners Do: Power, Politics and Persuasion*. Chicago: Planners Press.

Hochschild, J. L. 1995. *Facing up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Holton, S. S. 2001. Segregation, racism and white women reformers: A transnational analysis, 1840–1912. *Women's History Review* 10(1): 5–25.

Hood, E. 2005. Dwelling disparities: How poor housing leads to poor health. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 113: A310–19.

Horowitz, C. R., Colson, K. A., Hebert, P. L., and Lancaster, K. 2004. Barriers to buying healthy foods for people with diabetes: Evidence of environmental disparities. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(9): 1549–54.

Howard, E. 1965. *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hull-House, Residents of. 1895. *Hull House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, Together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing out of the Social Conditions*. New York: Crowell.

Huntersview Tenants Association and Green Action for Health and Environmental Justice. 2004. *Pollution, Health, Environmental Racism and Injustice: A Toxic Inventory of Bayview Hunters Point, San Francisco*. www.partnerships.ucsf.edu/pdfs/pdf_commdata_02.pdf.

Hurley, A. 1995. *Environmental inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945–1980*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Iacofano, D. 2007. Principal, MIG planning firm. Personal communication.

Iceland, J. 2004. Beyond black and white: Metropolitan residential segregation in multi-ethnic America. *Social Science Research* 33: 248–71.

Iglesias, T. 2003. Housing impact assessments: Opening new doors for state housing regulation while localism persists. *Oregon Law Review* 82: 433–516.

Initiative for a Competitive Inner City. 2002. *The Changing Models of Inner City Grocery Retailing*. Boston: Initiative for a Competitive Inner City.

Innes, J. E. 1995. Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14(4): 183–89.

Innes, J. E. 1996. Planning through consensus building: A new view of the comprehensive planning ideal. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62: 460–72.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Institute of Medicine (IOM). 1988. *The Future of Public Health*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Institute of Medicine (IOM). 2001. *Rebuilding the Unity of Health and the Environment: A New Vision of Environmental Health for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Institute of Medicine (IOM). 2000a. Neighborhood and community. In Shonkoff, J., and Phillips, D. A., eds., *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, pp. 328–36.

Institute of Medicine (IOM). 2000b. *Promoting Health: Intervention Strategies from Social and Behavioral Research*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Institute of Medicine (IOM). 2003. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

International Association of Impact Assessment (IAIA). 2006. *Health Impact Assessment: International Best Practice Principles*. http://www.iaia.org/Non_Members/Pubs_Ref_Material/SP5.pdf.

Isaacs, R. 1948. The neighborhood unit is an instrument of segregation. *Journal of Housing* 5: 215–19.

Ison, E. 2000. *Resource for Health Impact Assessment: The Main Resource*, vols. 1–2. London: NHS Executive.

Iton, T. 2007. Director of Alameda County Public Health Department. Presentation to the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan, Task Force Meeting. August 14.

Jackson, S. A., and Anderson, R. T. 2000. The relation of residential segregation to all-cause mortality: A study in black and white. *American Journal of Public Health* 90: 615–17.

Jackson, J. B. 1984. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jacobs, J. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

James, S. 1993. Racial and ethnic differences in infant mortality and low birth weight: A psychosocial critique. *Annals of Epidemiology* 3: 130–36.

James, S., Schultz, A. J., and van Olphen, J. 2001. Social capital, poverty, and community health: An exploration of linkage. In Saegert, S., Thompson, J. P., and Warren, M. R., eds., *Social Capital and Poor Communities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 165–88.

Jamison, A. 2002. *The Making of Green Knowledge: Environmental Politics and Cultural Transformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Jasanoff, S. 2004. The idiom of co-production. In Jasanoff, S., ed., *States of Knowledge: The Co-production of Science and Social Order*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–45.

Jasanoff, S. 2005. *Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jasanoff, S. 2006. Transparency in public science: Purposes, reasons, limits. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 69: 21–45.

Jencks, C., and Petersen, P. E., eds. 1991. *The Urban Underclass*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Johnson, C. 2007. Chevron looks to profits, Richmond looks to health. *San Francisco Chronicle,* June 8, p. B1.

Jones, K., and Duncan, C. 1995. Individuals and their ecologies: Analyzing the geography of chronic illness within a multilevel modeling framework. *Health and Place* 1: 27–30.

Jones, C. P. 2000. Levels of racism: A theoretic framework and a gardener's tale. *American Journal of Public Health* 90;8: 1212–15.

Jones, P. 2006. Personal communication.

Jones, V. 2008. *The Green Collar Economy*. New York: HarperOne.

Judd, D. R., and Swanstrom, T. 1998. *City Politics: Private Power and Public Policy*. New York: Longman.

Kaplan, G. A. 1999. What is the role of the social environment in understanding inequalities in health? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 896: 116–20.

Kaplan, G. A., Pamuk, E. R., Lynch, J. M., Cohen, R. D., and Balfour, J. L. 1996. Inequality in income and mortality in the United States: Analysis of mortality and potential pathways. *British Medical Journal* 312: 999–1003.

Karkkainen, B. C. 2002. Toward a smarter NEPA: Monitoring and managing government's environmental performance. *Columbia Law Review* 102: 903–72.

Karpati, A. 2004. Assistant Commissioner, Brooklyn District Public Health Office. *Testimony before New York State Assembly Committee on Health and the Black, Puerto Rican and Hispanic Legislative Caucus*. April 22. Division of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Assembly Hearing Room, New York, New York. http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/html/public/testi/testi20040422.html.

Karpati, A., Kerker, B., Mostashari, F., Singh, T., Hajat, A., Thorpe, L., Bassett, M., Henning, K., and Frieden, T. 2004. *Health Disparities in New York City*. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. www.nyc.gov/html/doh/pdf/epi/disparities-2004.pdf.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Kates, R., Clark, W., Corell, R., Hall, J. M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., McCarthy, J. J., Schellnhuber, H. J., Bolin, B., Dickson, N. M., Faucheux, S., Gallopin, G. C., Grübler, A., Huntley, B., Jäger, J., Jodha, N. S., Kasperson, R. E., Mabogunje, A., Matson, P., Mooney, H., Moore III, B., O'Riordan, T., and Svedin, U. 2001. Sustainability science. *Science* 292(5517): 641–42.

Katz, B. 2007. *Blueprint for American Prosperity: Metronation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute. http://www.brookings.edu/projects/blueprint.aspx.

Katz, M. 2006. Health programs in Bayview Hunter's Point and recommendations for improving the health of Bayview Hunter's Point residents. San Francisco Department of Public Health, Office of Policy and Planning. September 19.

Katz, M. 2006b. Personal communication.

Kaufman, J. 2004. Introduction. Special issue: Planning for community food systems. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23: 335–40.

Kawachi, I., and Berkman, L. 2003. *Neighborhoods and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kawachi, I., and Kennedy, B. 1999. Income inequality and health: Pathways and mechanisms. *Health Services Research* 34(1): 215–27.

Kearns, R. 1993. Place and health: towards a reformed medical geography. *Professional Geographer* 45: 139–47.

Kegler, M. C., Norton, B. L., and Aronson, R. E. 2003. *Evaluation of the Five-Year Expansion Program of California Healthy Cities and Communities (1998–2003)*. http://www.civicpartnerships.org/docs/publications/TCEFinalReport9-2003.pdf.

Keller, E. F. 1985. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Keller, E. F. 2000. *The Century of the Gene*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kelly, M. P., Morgan, A., Bonnefoy, J., Butt, J., and Bergman, V. 2007. The social determinants of health: Developing an evidence base for political action. World Health Organization, Commission on the Social Determinants of Health. International Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, Geneva.

Kemm, J. 1999. Developing health impact assessment in Wales. Cardiff: Health Promotion Division, National Assembly for Wales.

Kemm, J. 2005. The future challenges for HIA. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 25: 799–807.

Kemm, J., Parry, J., and Palmer, S., eds. 2004. *Health Impact Assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Kevles, D. J. 1985. *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. New York: Knopf.

Killingsworth, R., Earp, J., and Moore, R. 2003. Supporting health through design: Challenges and opportunities. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 18(1): 1–2.

Kingdon, J. W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*, 2nd ed. NewYork: Harper-Collins.

Kjellstrom, T., Mercado, S., Sattherthwaite, D., McGranahan, G., Friel, S., and Havemann, K. 2007. Our cities, our health, our future: Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. World Health Organization, Centre for Health Development, Kobe City, Japan.

Klinenberg, E. 2002. *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of a Disaster*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kling, J. R., Liebman, J. B., Katz, L. F., and Sanbonmatsu, L. 2004. *Moving to Opportunity and Tranquility: Neighborhood Effects on Adult Economic Self-sufficiency and Health from a Randomized Housing Voucher Experiment*. http://nber.org/~kling/mto/481.pdf.

Kling, J. R., and Del Conte, A. 2001. Synthesis of MTO research on self-sufficiency, safety and health, and behavior and delinquency. *Poverty Research News* 5(1): 3–6.

Knight, H. 2008. San Francisco officials on legislative binge to make the city healthier. *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 4, p. A1.

Kraut, A. 1988. Silent travelers: Germs, genes, and American efficiency, 1890–1924. *Social Science History* 12: 377–93.

Kreidler, A. G. 1919. A community self organized for preventive health work. *Modern Medicine* 1: 26–31.

Krieger, J., and Higgins, D. L. 2002. Housing and health: Time again for public health action. *American Journal of Public Health* 92(5): 758–68.

Krieger, N. 1999. Sticky webs, hungry spiders, buzzing flies, and fractal metaphors: On the misleading juxtaposition of "risk factor" vs "social" epidemiology. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 53: 678–80.

Krieger, N. 2001. Theories of social epidemiology for the 21st century: An ecosocial perspective. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 30: 668–77.

Krieger, N., ed. 2004. *Embodying Inequality: Epidemiologic Perspectives*. Amityville, NY: Baywood.

Krieger, N., and Davey Smith, G. 2004. "Bodies count," and body counts: Social epidemiology and embodying inequality. *Epidemiolgic Reviews* 26: 92–103.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Krieger, N. 2000. Epidemiology and social sciences: Toward a critical reengagement in the 21st century. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 22: 155–63.

Krieger, N. 2005. Embodiment: A conceptual glossary for epidemiology. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 59: 350–55.

Krieger, N. 2006. A century of census tracts: Health and the body politic (1906–2006). *Journal of Urban Health* 83: 355–61.

Krieger, N. 2008. Proximal, distal, and the politics of causation: What's level got to do with it? *American Journal of Public Health* 98: 221–30.

Krugman, P. 1998. Space: The final frontier. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (spring): 161–74.

Kuehn, R. R. 1996. The environmental justice implications of quantitative risk assessment. *University of Illinois Law Review* 38: 103–72.

Kuehn, R. R. 2000. A taxonomy of environmental justice. *Environmental Law Reporter* 30: 10681–703.

Kuznets, S. 1965. *Economic Growth and Structure*. New York: Norton.

Lane, S. 2007. Urban Habitat. Personal communication.

Lasch-Quinn, E. 1993. *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890–1945*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Lashley, K. 2008. Health-care provision meets microcredit finance in Argentina. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 86(1): 9–10.

Latour, B. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Engineers and Scientists through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

LaVeist, T. A., and Wallace, J. M. Jr. 2000. Health risk and inequitable distribution of liquor stores in African American neighborhood. *Social Science and Medicine* 51: 613–17.

Lawrence, D. P. 2003. *Environmental Impact Assessment: Practical Solutions to Recurrent Problems*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Leal, S. 2006. San Francisco's clean energy revolution is here. *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 14, p. B7.

Lear, L. 1997. *Rachel Carson: Witness for Nature*. New York: Henry Holt.

Leavitt, J. W. 1992. Typhoid Mary strikes back: Bacteriological theory and practice in early twentieth-century public health. *Isis* 83: 608–29.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Leavitt, J. W. 1996. *The Healthiest City: Milwaukee and the Politics of Health Reform*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Leavitt, J. W. 1996b. *Typhoid Mary: Captive to the People's Health*. Boston: Beacon Press.

LeClere, F. B., Rogers, R. G., and Peters, K. D. 1997. Ethnicity and mortality in the United States: Individual and community correlates. *Social Forces* 76: 169–98.

Lee, M., and Rubin, V. 2007. The impact of the built environment on community health: The state of current practice and next steps for a growing movement. *Policy Link and The California Endowment*. http://www.calendow.org/Collection_Publications.aspx?coll_id=44&ItemID=310.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lefkowitz, B. 2007. *Community Health Centers: A Movement and the People Who Made It Happen*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lehto, J., and Ritsatakis, A. 1999. Health impact assessment as a tool for intersectoral health policy. Discussion paper for the Conference on Health Impact Assessment: From Theory to Practice. Gothenburg: European Center for Health Policy.

Lemann, N. 1991. *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*. New York: Knopf.

Lempinen, E. W. 1998. Loft-war raging in SoMa live-work spaces provide housing but displace businesses, artists. *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 30, p. A1.

Lewis, N. P. 1916. *The Planning of the Modern City: A Review of the Principles Governing City Planning*. New York: Wiley.

Link, B., and Phelan, J. 2000. Evaluating the fundamental cause explanation for social disparities in health. In Bird, C., Conrad, P., and Freemont, A., eds., *The Handbook of Medical Sociology*, 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 33–46.

Logan, J. 2003. Life and death in the city: Neighborhoods in context. *Contexts* 2: 33–40.

Logan, J. R., and Molotch, H. 1987. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Logan, T. 1976. The Americanization of German zoning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planning* 42(4): 377–85.

London Health Observatory. 2002. A guide to health and health services for town planners in London. Regeneration and Planning Task Group of the Health of Londoners Project (London). www.lho.org.uk/Publications/Attachments/PDF_Files/ghhstpl_text.pdf.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Lubchenco, J. 1998. Entering the century of the environment: A new social contract for science. *Science* 279: 491–97.

Lubove, R. 1974. *The Progressives and the Slums: Tenement House Reform in New York City, 1870–1917*. Westport: Greenwood.

Luks, S. 2005. *Power: A Radical View*, 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lynch, S. M. 2003. Cohort and life-course patterns in the relationship between education and health: A hierarchical approach. *Demography* 40: 309–31.

Maantay, J. 2001. Zoning, equity and public health. *American Journal of Public Health* 91: 1033–41.

MacArthur, I. D. 2002. *Local Environmental Health Planning: Guidance for Local and National Authorities*. Copenhagen: World Health Organization.

Macintyre, S., Ellaway, A., and Cubbins, S. 2002. Place effects on health: How can we conceptualize, operationalize, and measure them? *Social Science and Medicine* 55: 125–39.

Macintyre, S., Maciver, S., and Sooma, A. 1993. Area, class, and health: Should we be focusing on places or people? *Journal of Social Policy* 22: 213–34.

Macris, D. 2006. Interim planning director, City of San Francisco. Personal communication, October 14.

Majone, G. 1989. *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marcuse, P. 1980. Housing policy and city planning: The puzzling split in the United States, 1893–1931. In Cherry, G. E., ed., *Shaping an Urban World*. London: Mansell, pp. 23–58.

Markel, H. 2004. *When Germs Travel: Six Major Epidemics That Have Invaded America Since 1900 and the Fears They Have Unleashed*. New York: Pantheon.

Markel, H. 1997. *Quarantine! East European Jewish Immigrants and the New York City Epidemics of 1892*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Markel, H., and Stern, A. M. 2002. The foreignness of germs: The persistent association of immigrants and disease in American society. *Milbank Quarterly* 80(4): 757–88.

Marmot, M., Siegrist, J., Theorell, T., and Feeney, A. 2005. Health and the psychosocial environment at work. In Marmot, M., and Wilkinson, R. G., eds., *Social Determinants of Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marris, P. 1996. *The Politics of Uncertainty: Attachment in Private and Public Life*. New York: Routledge.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Marsh, B. 1908. City planning in justice to the working man. *Charities and the Commons* 19 (February): 1514.

Marsh, B. 1909. *An Introduction to City Planning: Democracy's Challenge to the American City*. New York: Committee on Congestion of Population in New York.

Martin, G. 2005. San Francisco sits at the vanguard of urban areas trying to keep the future a deep shade of green. *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 29, p. D1.

Marx, K. 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed. Robert C. Tucker, ed. New York: Norton.

Massey, D. S., and Denton, N. A. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McClain, C. 1988. Of medicine, race, and American law: The bubonic plague outbreak of 1900. *Law and Social Inquiry* 13(3): 447–513.

McCord, C., and Freeman, H. P. 1990. Excess mortality in Harlem. *New England Journal of Medicine* 322: 173–77.

McCormick, E., and Holding, R. 2004. Too young to die. A Special Report. *San Francisco Chronicle*. October 7. http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2004/10/07/MNGII94D931.DTL.

McEwen, B. 1998. Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *New England Journal of Medicine* 338(3): 171–79.

McEwen, B. S., and Seeman, T. 1999. Protective and damaging effects of mediators of stress: Elaborating and testing the concepts of allostasis and allostatic load. In Adler, N., Marmot, M., McEwen, B., and Stewart, J., eds., Socioeconomic status and health in industrial nations: Social, psychological and biological pathways. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 896: 30–47.

McGrath, J. J., Matthews, K. A., and Brady, S. S. 2006. Individual versus neighborhood socioeconomic status and race as predictors of adolescent ambulatory blood pressure and heart rate. *Social Science and Medicine* 63(6): 1442–53.

McKeown, T. 1976. *The Modern Rise of Population*. New York: Academic Press.

Meeker, E. 1972. The improving health of the United States, 1850–1915. *Explorations in Economic History* 9(4): 353–73.

Melendez, M. 2003. *We Took the Streets: Fighting for Latino Rights with the Young Lords*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Melosi, M. V. 1973. "Out of sight, out of mind:" The environment and disposal of municipal refuse, 1860–1920. *Historian* 35: 629–40.

Melosi, M. V. 1980. *Pollution and Reform in American Cities, 1870–1930*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Melosi, M. V. 2000. *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Merchant, C. 1985. The Women of the Progressive Conservation Crusade: 1900–1915. In Bailes, K. E., ed., *Environmental History: Critical Issues in Comparative Perspective*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 153–75.

Merchant, C. 1993. *Major Problems in American Environmental History: Documents and Essays*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Meyerson, M., and Banfield, E. C. 1955. *Politics, Planning, and the Public Interest; the Case of Public Housing in Chicago*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Milio, N. 1986. *Promoting Health through Public Policy*. Ottawa: Canadian Public Health Association.

Miller, Z. L., and Melvin, P. M. 1987. *The Urbanization of Modern America: A Brief History*, 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Mindell, J., and Joffe, M. 2003. Health impact assessment in relation to other forms of impact assessment. *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 25: 107–13.

Mindell, J., Boaz, A., Joffe, M., Curtis, S., and Birley, M. 2004. Enhancing the evidence base for health impact assessment. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 58: 546–51.

Mindell, J., Ison, E., and Joffe, M. 2003. A glossary for health impact assessment. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 57(9): 647–51.

Mishel, L., Bernstein, J., and Allegretto, S. 2007. *The State of Working America 2006/2007*. Ithaca: ILR Press.

Mishler, E. G. 1981. Viewpoint: Critical perspectives on the biomedical model. In Mishler, E. G., Amara Singham, L. R., Hauser, S. T., Liem, R., Osherson, S. D., and Waxler, N. E., eds., *Social Contexts of Health, Illness, and Patient Care*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–24.

Mission Anti-displacement Coalition (MAC). 2004. *The Hidden Costs of the New Economy: A Study of the Northeast Mission Industrial Zone*. www.uncanny.net/~wetzel/nemizreport.htm.

Mission Anti-displacement Coalition (MAC). 2005. *People's Plan*. http://podersf.org/docs/PeoplesPlan.pdf.

Mitchell, R. 2007. Director of city planning, City of Richmond, California. Personal communication. July.

Mohl, R. A. 2000. Planned destruction: The interstates and central city housing. In Bauman, J. F., Biles, R., and Szylvian, K. M., eds., *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in 20th Century America*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 226–45.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Mollenkopf, J. 1983. *The Contested City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Molotoch, H. 1976. The city as growth machine: Toward a political economy of place. *American Journal of Sociology* 82(2): 309–32.

Morello-Frosch, R., and Jesdale, B. M. 2006. Separate and unequal: Residential segregation and estimated cancer risks associated with ambient air toxics in U.S. metropolitan areas. *Environmental Health Perspective* 114: 386–93.

Morland, K., Wing, S., Diez Roux, A., and Poole, C. 2002. Neighborhood characteristics associated with the location of food stores and food service places. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 22: 23–29.

Moses, R. 1945. Slums and city planning. *Atlantic Monthly* 175(1): 63–68.

Mullan, F. 1989. *Plagues and Politics: The Story of the United States Public Health Service*. New York: Basic Books.

Mumford, L. 1955. *Sticks and Stones: A Study of American Architecture and Civilization*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Dover.

National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO). 2004. *Integrating Public Health into Land Use Decision-Making*. http://www.naccho.org/project84.cfm.

National Conference on City Planning. 1909. *Proceedings of the First National Conference on City Planning, Washington, DC, May 21–22, 1909*. Reprint 1967: Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials.

National Institutes of Health (NIH). 2004. What Are Health Disparities? http://healthdisparities.nih.gov/whatare.html.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1994. Interorganizational Committee on Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment. National Marine Fisheries Service. Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/social_impact_guide.htm.

National Research Council. 2002. *Equality of Opportunity and the Importance of Place: Summary of a Workshop*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Science Foundation (NSF). 2007. Top scientists promote innovative, multidisciplinary global problem-solving strategies. http://www.nsf.gov:80/discoveries/disc_summ.jsp?cntn_id=110848.

Nelson, N. A. 1919. Neighborhood organizing vs. tuberculosis. *Modern Medicine* 1: 515–21.

New York City Department of Correction (DOC). 2003. *Annual Report. New York*. http://www.nyc.gov/html/doc/html/stats/doc_stats.shtml.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYCDOHMH). 2004. *Take Care New York*. http://nyc.gov/html/doh/html/tcny/index.shtml.

Nolen, J. 1924. *Importance of Citizens' Committees in Securing Public Support for a City Planning Program*. Cambridge, MA: National Conference on City Planning.

Norberg-Hodge, H., Merrifield, T., and Gorelick, S. 2002. *Bringing the Food Economy Home: Local Alternatives to Global Agribusiness*. London: Zed.

Norris, T., and Pittman, M. 2000. The healthy communities movement and the coalition for healthier cities and communities. *Public Health Reports* 115: 118–23.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P., and Gibbons, M. 2001. *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nussbaum, M. 2000. *Women and Human Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oberlander, P. H., and Newbrun, E. 1999. *Houser: The Life and Work of Catherine Bauer*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

O'Connor, A. 2002. *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century U.S. History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Office of Inspector General (OIG). 2006. *United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Needs to Conduct Environmental Justice Reviews of Its Programs, Policies, and Activities*. www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2006/20060918-2006-P-00034.pdf.

Olmsted, F. L. Jr. 1910. City planning: An introductory address at the second national conference on city planning and congestion of population, Rochester, NY, May 2. American Civic Association, Department of City Making, series 2, no. 4.

Ona, F. 2005. Personal communication.

Orfield, M. 1997. *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Pacific Institute. 2002. *Neighborhood Knowledge for Change: The West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project*. www.pacinst.org.

Pacific Institute. 2003. *Clearing the Air: Reducing Diesel Pollution in West Oakland. Issued in conjunction with the Coalition for West Oakland Revitalization*. www.pacinst.org/diesel.

Pacific Institute. 2006. *Paying with Our Health: The Real Cost of Freight Transport in California*. www.pacinst.org/reports/freight_transport.

Parfitt, J. 1987. *The Health of a City: Oxford, 1770–1974*. Oxford: Amate Press.

Park, R. E. 1929. The city as social laboratory. In Smith, T. V., and White, L. D., eds., *Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–19.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Parry, J. M., and Kemm, J. 2005. Criteria for use in evaluation of health impact assessments. *Public Health* 119: 1122–29.

Passchier-Vermeer, W., and Passchier, W. F. 2000. Noise exposure and public health. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 108: 123–31.

Pastor, M., Benner, C., and Rosner, R. 2006. *Edging toward Equity: Creating Shared Opportunity in America's Regions*. cjtc.ucsc.edu/docs/r_CORE_Edging_Toward _Equity_summary.pdf.

Pastor, M. J., Saad, J., and Morello-Frosh, R. 2007. *Still Toxic after All These Years: Air Quality and Environmental Justice in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, University of California, Santa Cruz. http://cjtc .ucsc.edu.

Payne-Sturges, D. C., Burke, T. A., Breysse, P., Diener-West, M., and Buckley, T. J. 2004. Personal exposure meets risk assessment: A comparison of measured and modeled exposures and risks in an urban community. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 112: 589–98.

Pearce, N., Foliaki, S., Sporle, A., and Cunningham, C. 2004. Genetics, race, ethnicity, and health. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1070–72.

Pellow, D. 2002. *Garbage Wars: The Struggle for Environmental Justice in Chicago*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Peoples Grocery. 2008. http://www.peoplesgrocery.org/index.php?topic=programs.

Perera, F. P., Rauh, V., Whyatt, R. M., Tsai, W. Y., Tang, D., Diaz, D., Hoepner, L., Barr, D., Tu, Y. H., Camann, D., and Kinney, P. 2006. Effect of prenatal exposure to airborne polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons on neurodevelopment in the first 3 years of life among inner-city children. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114(8): 1287–92.

Perry, C. A. 1929. City planning for neighborhood life. *Social Forces* 8(1): 98–100.

Petersen, P. E., ed. 1985. *The New Urban Reality*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Peterson, J. 1979. The impact of sanitary reform upon American urban planning, 1840–1890. *Journal of Social History* 13: 83–103.

Peterson, J. 2003. *The Birth of City Planning in the United States, 1840–1917*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Petts, J. 1999. Public participation in environmental impact assessment. In Petts, J., ed., *Handbook of Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Methods and Potential*, vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 145–77.

Philpott, T. L. 1991. *The Slum and the Ghetto: Immigrants, Blacks, and Reformers in Chicago, 1880–1930*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Pluntz, R. 1990. *A History of Modern Housing in New York City: Dwelling Type and Social Change in the American Metropolis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Polednak, A. P. 1996. Trends in U.S. urban black infant mortality, by degree of residential segregation. *American Journal of Public Health* 86: 723–26.

PolicyLink. 2002. *Reducing Health Disparities through a Focus on Communities*. Oakland: PolicyLink. www.policylink.org/Research/HealthDisparities.

Port of Oakland. 2007. *Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan*. Task Force Meeting, August 14. http://www.portofoakland.com/environm/prog_04c_info.asp.

Porter, D. 2001. *Health, Civilization and the State: A History of Public Health from Ancient to Modern Times*. London: Routledge.

Porter, T. 1995. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Portney, K. 2004. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Pothukuchi, K., and Kaufman, J. 1999. Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food systems planning. *Agriculture and Human Values* 16: 213–24.

Pothukuchi, K., and Kaufman, J. 2000. The food system: A stranger to the planning field. *American Planning Association Journal* 66(2): 113–24.

Powell, J. A. 2000. *The Racial Justice and Regional Equity Project*. http://www1.umn.edu/irp/rjreindex.html.

Prakash, S. 2007. Pacific Institute project director, Ditching Dirty Diesel Collaborative, Personal communication.

Prentice, B. 2007. BARHII. Personal communication.

Puentes, R., and Warren, D. 2006. *One Fifth of America: A Comprehensive Guide to America's First Suburbs*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Quigley, R., den Broeder, L., Furu, P., Bond, A., Cave, B., and Bos, R. 2006. *Health Impact Assessment International Best Practice Principles*. Special Publication series no. 5. Fargo, ND: International Association for Impact Assessment. http://www.iaia.org/modx/assets/files/SP5.pdf.

Raphael, D. 2006. Social determinants of health: Present status, unresolved questions, and future directions. *International Journal of Health Services* 36: 651–77.

Ratner, B. 2004. "Sustainability" as a dialogue of values: Challenges to the sociology of development. *Sociological Inquiry* 74(1): 50–69.

Reiss, J. R. 2006. *Making History: Precautionary Principle Law in the San Francisco Bay Area*. The Bay Area Working Group on the Precautionary Principle. Public presentation. www.takingprecation.org.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Reps, J. W. 1965. *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Richardson, B. W. 1875. *Hygeia: A City of Health*. London: Macmillan.

Richmond, City of. 2007a. Richmond General Plan Update. *Issues and Opportunities Paper 8: Community Health and Wellness*. http://www.cityofrichmondgeneralplan.org/docs.php?view=topics.

Richmond, City of. 2007b. *Health Policy Element Added to General Plan*. http://www.cityofrichmondgeneralplan.org/news.php?display=1&oid=1000000375.

Riis, J. 1890. *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York*. New York: Penguin.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF). 2004. *Active Living by Design Program*. http://www.activelivingbydesign.org.

Roberts, D. 2003. *Shattered Bonds: The Color of Child Welfare*. New York: Basic Books.

Roberts, S. 1991. A critical evaluation of the city life cycle idea. *Urban Geography* 12: 431–43.

Rodgers, V. 2006. Land-use and health project director, National Association of City and County Health Officials (NACCHO). Personal communication.

Rodwin, V. 1984. *The Health Planning Predicament: France, Quebec, England, and the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rojas, A. 1997. High rates of disease in Bayview: Study lends weight to pollution fears. *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 9, p. A1.

Rosen, G. 1971. The first neighborhood health center movement—Its rise and fall. *American Journal of Public Health* 61: 1620–37.

Rosen, G. 1993. *A History of Public Health*, exp.ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rosenbaum, J., and Rubinowitz, L. S. 2000. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosenkrantz, B. 1972. *Public Health and the State: Changing Views in Massachusetts, 1842–1936*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rosenzweig, R., and Blackmar, E. 1992. *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rosner, D., and Markowitz, G. 1985. The early movement for occupational safety and health. In Leavitt, J. W., and Numbers, R. L., eds., *Sickness and Health in America: Readings in the History of Medicine and Public Health*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 507–21.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Rubin, V. 2007. Personal communication.

Sabatier, P. A., and Jenkins-Smith, H. C., eds. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

San Francisco Chronicle. 2005. Shakedown at City Hall. editorial. http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2005/08/10/EDG9OE4U9U1.DTL.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 1992. Hospitalizations for Bayview Hunters Point, 1991–1992.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 1994. Comparison of incidence of cancer in selected sites between Bayview Hunters Point and the Bay Area.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2000. Overview of Health. Community Programs Division. www.dph.sf.ca.us.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2001. Overview of Health. Community Programs Division. www.dph.sf.ca.us.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2003a. Comment letter on Trinity Plaza Project. September 8. http://www.sfdph.org/phes/publications/comments/Comment_on_Trinity_DEIR_scope.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2003b. Comment letter on Spear and Folsom Towers. http://www.sfdph.org/phes/publications/comments/Comment_on_Spear_Folsom_DEIR.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2004a. Trinity Plaza EIR comment letter. http://www.sfdph.org/phes/publications/reports/HIAR-May2004.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2004b. Rincon Hill EIR comments. www.dph.sf.ca.us/phes/publications/comments/RinconAreaPlanDEIRcomment.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2004c. The case for housing impacts assessment: The human health and social impacts of inadequate housing and their consideration in CEQA policy and practice. http://www.sfdph.org/phes/publications/reports/HIAR-May2004.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2004d. Demographic, economic, and housing data: A lens into the Mission District, San Francisco, California. http://www.dph.sf.ca.us/ehs/phesmain.htm.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2004e. Prevention Strategic Plan, 2004 2008, Five-Year Plan. http://www.sfdph.org/Reports/PPRpts.htm.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2005. *Program on Health, Equity and Sustainability, 2005 Annual Report*. http://www.sfdph.org/phes/publications/PHES_2005_Annual_Report.pdf.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2007a. *Eastern Neighborhoods Community Health Impact Assessment*. Final report. Program on Health, Equity and Sustainability. http://www.sfphes.org/enchia/2007_09_05_ENCHIA_FinalReport.pdf.

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). 2007b. Impacts on Community Health of Area Plans for the Mission, East SoMa, and Potrero Hill / Showplace Square: An Application of the Healthy Development Measurement Tool. December 25. www.thehdmt.org.

San Francisco Environment (SF Environment). 2005. *2004–2005, Annual Report. San Francisco Department of the Environment*. http://www.sfenvironment.org/index.html.

San Francisco Environment (SF Environment). 2006. *Precautionary Principle Ordinance*. http://www.sfenvironment.com/aboutus/policy/legislation/precaution_principle.htm.

San Francisco Fetal Infant Mortality Review Program. 1998. *Annual Report of Findings to the Community*. California Birth Defects Monitoring Program, 1999.

San Francisco Food Alliance. 2006. June 1 Meeting Minutes. http://www.sffoodsystems.org/pdf/SF%20Food%20Alliance%20Meeting%2006-01-06.pdf.

San Francisco Food Systems (SFFS). 2004. *Increasing Access of Low-Income San Franciscans to Farmers' Markets. December*. San Francisco Department of Public Health.

San Francisco Food Systems (SFFS). 2005. *Collaborative Food Systems Assessment*. A project of the San Francisco Foundation Community Initiative Funds and the San Francisco Department of Public Health. http://www.sffoodsystems.org/pdf/FSA-online.pdf.

San Francisco Mayor's Office of Community Development (SFMOCD). 2005. SoMa Community Stabilization Fund and Advisory Committee. http://www.sfgov.org/site/mocd_index.asp?id=44635.

San Francisco Planning Department (SFPD). 2003. *Community Planning in the Eastern Neighborhoods: Rezoning Options Workbook*. Department of Planning, City and County of San Francisco.

San Francisco Planning Department (SFPD). 2006. *Executive Park: Sub-area Plan of the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan*. http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=42414.

San Francisco Planning Department (SFPD). 2007. Executive park subarea plan: Community workshop summary of comments. November 1. http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=42414.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Sassen, S. 1991. *The Global City; New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Satcher, D., Fryer, G. E., McCann, J., Troutman, A., Woolf, S. H., and Rust, G. 2005. What if we were equal? A comparison of the black-white mortality gap in 1960 and 2000. *Health Affairs* 24: 459–64.

Satterfield, D. 2002. The "in-between people": Participation of community health representatives in diabetes prevention and care in American Indian and Alaska Native communities. *Health Promotion Practice* 3(2): 166–75.

Saxenian, A. 1996. *The Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Scheper-Hughes, N. 1992. *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schultz, S., and McShane, C. 1978. To engineer the metropolis: Sewers, sanitation and city planning in late nineteenth century. *American Journal of American History* 65(2): 389–411.

Schulz, A. J., Williams, D. R., Israel, B. A., and Bex Lempert, L. 2002. Racial and spatial relations as fundamental determinants of health in Detroit. *Milbank Quarterly* 80: 677–707.

Schulz, A. J., Kannan, S., Dvonch, J. T., Israel, B. A., Allen, A. III., James, S. A., House, J. S., and Lepkowski, J. 2005. Social and physical environments and disparities in risk for cardiovascular disease: The Healthy Environments Partnership Conceptual Model. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 113: 1817–25.

Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, M. 1971. *American City Planning Since 1890*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scott-Samuel, A. 1996. Health impact assessment: An idea whose time has come. *British Medical Journal* 313(1): 183–84.

Scott-Samuel, A. 1998. Health impact assessment: Theory into practice. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 52: 704–705.

Scott-Samuel, A., Birley, M., and Ardern, K. 1998. *The Merseyside guidelines for Health Impact Assessment*. Liverpool: Merseyside Health Impact Assessment Steering Group. http://www.liv.ac.uk/~mhb/publicat/merseygui/index.htm.

Seligman, K. 1998. Everyone wants a piece of the Mission. *San Francisco Examiner*, October 26, p. A1.

Sellers, C. 1994. Factory as environment: Industrial hygiene, professional collaboration and the modern sciences of pollution. *Environmental History Review* 18: 55–84.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Selna, R. 2007. Trinity deal hits a snag; some supervisors want more units at a rate below market. *San Francisco Chronicle,* January 4, p. B1.

Selznick, P. 1992. *The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Semenza, J. C., McCullough, J. E., Flanders, W. D., McGeehin, M. A., and Lumpkin, J. R. 1999. Excess hospital admissions during the July 1995 heat wave in Chicago. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 16(4): 269–77.

Shah, N. 2001. *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sharfstein, J., Sandel, M., Kahn, R., and Bauchner, H. 2001. Is child health at risk while families wait for housing vouchers? *American Journal of Public Health* 91: 1191–92.

Sharfstein, J., and Sandel, M., eds. 1998. *Not Safe at Home: How America's Housing Crisis Threatens the Health of Its Children*. Boston: Boston University Medical Center.

Shaw, M., David, G., Danny, D., Richard, M., and Davey Smith, G. 2000. Increasing mortality differentials by residential area level of poverty: Britain 1981–1997. *Social Science Medicine* 51: 151–53.

Shaw, R. 1996. *The Activist's Handbook: A Premier for the 1990s and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shaw, R. 2007. The future of San Francisco's Mission District. *Beyond Chronicle,* January 22. www.beyondchron.org/news/index.php?itemid=4110.

Shon, D., and Rein, M. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.

Silicon Valley Network, Joint Venture. 2000. *Index of Silicon Valley: Measuring Progress toward the Goals of Silicon Valley 2010*. www.Jointventure.org.

Smith, M. P. 2001. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Smith, S. 1995. *Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired: Black Women's Health Activism in America, 1890–1950*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Snow, C. P. 1962. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Soja, E. W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.

Solnit, R. 2000. *Hollow City*. New York: Verso.

Solomon, L. R. 1998. *Roots of Justice: Stories of Organizing in Communities of Color*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Sood, V. 2007. Project director, MIG planning. Personal communication. July.

South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN). 2004. Comment letter to the Department of City Planning on the Rincon Hill Draft Environmental Impact Report. December 8.

South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN). 2006. State of SoMa presentation.

Sparer, G., and Johnson, J. 1971. Evaluation of OEO neighborhood health centers. *American Journal of Public Health* 61(5): 931–42.

Stansfeld, S., Haines, M., and Brown, B. 2000. Noise and health in the urban environment. *Review of Environmental Health* 15(1–2): 43–82.

Steinemann, A. 2000. Rethinking human health impact assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 20: 627–45.

Steinhauer, J. 2004. Drug and sex offenders face restrictions on public housing. *New York Times*, June 25, p. B1.

Stoll, M. A. 2005. *Job Sprawl and the Spatial Mismatch between Blacks and Jobs*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20050214_jobsprawl.htm.

Stone, C. 2004. It's more than the economy after all: Continuing the debate about urban regimes. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 26: 1–19.

Stradling, D. 1999. *Smokestacks and Progressives: Environmentalists, Engineers, and Air Quality in America, 1881–1951*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Suggs, E. 2005. Evictions from public housing near: Tenants told last October to get jobs or else. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, June 29.

Sugrue, T. J. 1996. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Susser, M., and Susser, E. 1996. Choosing a future for epidemiology: I. Eras and paradigms. *American Journal of Public Health* 86: 668–73.

Susskind, L., and Thomas-Larmer, J. 1999. Conducting a conflict assessment. In Susskind, L., McKearnan, S., and Thomas-Learner, J., eds., *The Consensus Building Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sydenstricker, E. 1934. Health and the depression. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 12: 273–80.

Takano, T. 2003. *Healthy Cities and Urban Policy Research*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Tarr, J. A. 1996. *The Search for the Ultimate Sink: Urban Pollution in Historical Perspective*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Tarr, J. A., and Lamperes, B. 1981. Changing fuel use behavior and energy transitions: The Pittsburgh smoke control movement, 1940–1950. A case study in historical analogy. *Journal of Social History* 14: 561–88.

Temple, J. 2003. Can rezoning satisfy housing advocates? *San Francisco Business Times*, June 20. www.sanfrancisco.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/stories/2003/06/23/focus2.html.

Tesh, S. 1988. *Hidden Arguments: Political Ideology and Disease Prevention Policy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Tesh, S. 1995. Miasma and "social factors" in disease causality: Lessons from the nineteenth century. *Journal of Health Politics Policy and Law* 20: 1001–24.

The Health of Boston. 2007. Boston Public Health Commission. Research Office. Boston.

Thomas, N. 2007. Personal communication.

Thomson, H., Petticrew, M., and Morrison, D. 2001. Health effects of housing improvement: Systematic review of intervention studies. *British Medical Journal* 323: 187–90.

Tickner, J. A., and Geiser, K. 2004. The precautionary principle stimulus for solutions- and alternatives-based environmental policy. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 24: 810–24.

Tickner, J. A. 2002. The precautionary principle and public health trade-offs: Case study of west Nile virus. *ANNALS, AAPSS* 584: 69–79.

Townsend, P., and Davidson, N., eds. 1982. *Inequalities in Health: The Black Report*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Trauner, J. B. 1978. The Chinese as medical scapegoats in San Francisco, 1870–1905. *California History* 57: 70–87.

Travis, J., Soloman, A. L., and Waul, M. 2001. *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Tritsch, S. 2007. The deadly difference. *Chicago Magazine*. October. http://www.chicagomag.com/Chicago-Magazine/October-2007/The-Deadly-Difference.

Tsouros, A., and Draper, R. A. 1993. The Healthy Cities project: New developments and research needs. In Davies, J. K., and Kelly, M. P., eds., *Healthy Cities—Research and Practice*. New York: Routledge, pp. 25–33.

United Nations Centre on Human Settlements (UNCHS). 2001. *The State of The World's Cities Report, 2001*. http://ww2.unhabitat.org/Istanbul+5/statereport.htm.

United Nations Centre on Human Settlements (UNCHS). 2007. *Global Campaign on Urban Governance: Principles*. http://www.unhabitat.org/content.asp?typeid=19&catid=25&cid=2097.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

United States Department of Labor (DOL). 2001. *Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries. Bureau of Labor Statistics*. www.bls.gov/oshcfoi1.html?H6.

Urban Habitat. 1999. *There Goes the Neighborhood: A Regional Analysis of Gentrification and Community Stability in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Oakland, CA: Urban Habitat.

US Conference of Mayors. 2006. *Climate Action Plan*. http://usmayors.org/climateprotection/agreement.htm.

US EPA. 1997. *Environmental Justice Guidance under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)*. www.epa.gov/oeca/ofa/ejepa.html.

US EPA. 2006. *CARE Facilitation Case Study*. West Oakland Collaborative. www.epa.gov/adr.

Vega, C. 2005. SoMa developer fee gets signed into law. *San Francisco Chroni*cle, August 20, p. B2.

Veneracion, A. 2005. Executive director, South of Market Community Action Network. Personal communication.

Villermé, L. R. 1829. Mémoire sure la taille de l'homme en France. *Annales d'hygiène publique et de médicine légale* 1: 351–99.

Villerme, L. R. 1830. De la mortalite dans divers quarters de la ville de Paris. *Annales d'hygiene publique* 3: 294–341.

Vlahov, D., Freudenberg, N., Proietti, F., Ompad, D., Quinn, A., Nandi, V., and Galea, S. 2007. Urban as a determinant of health. *Journal of Urban Health* 84: 16–26.

Von Hoffman, A. 2000. A study in contradictions: The origins and legacy of the housing act of 1949. *Housing Policy Debate* 11(2): 299–326.

Von Zielbauer, P. 2003. City creates post-jail plan for inmates. *New York Times,* September 20, p. B1.

Wachelder, J. 2003. Democratizing science: Various routes and visions of Dutch science shops. *Science, Technology and Human Values* 28(2): 244–73.

Wacquant, L. 1993. Urban outcasts: Stigma and division in the black American ghetto and the French urban periphery. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 17: 366–83.

Wacquant, L. 2002. Deadly symbiosis: Rethinking race and imprisonment in 21st Century America. *Boston Review*. www.bostonreview.net/BR27.2/wacquant.html.

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

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Wallace, D., and Wallace, R. 1998. *A Plague on Your Houses: How New York Was Burned Down and National Public Health Crumbled*. New York: Verso.

Wallace, R., and Wallace, D. 1990. Origins of public health collapse in New York City: The dynamics of planned shrinkage, contagious urban decay, and social disintegration. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 66: 391–437.

Walter, N., Bourgois, P., and Loinaz, H. M. 2002. Social context of work injury among undocumented day laborers in San Francisco. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 17(6): 221–29.

Waters, A. 2004. Slow food, slow schools: Transforming education through a school lunch curriculum. www.edibleschoolyard.org/alice_message.html.

Weatherell, C., Tregear, A., and Allinson, J. 2003. In search of the concerned consumer: UK public perceptions of food, farming and buying local. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19: 233–44.

Weber, E. 2003. *Bringing Society Back In: Grassroots Ecosystem Management, Accountability, and Sustainable Communities*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Weir, M. 1994. Urban poverty and defensive localism. *Dissent* 41: 337–42.

Weir, M. 2000. Planning, environmentalism and urban poverty. In Fishman, R., ed., *The American Planning Tradition: Culture and Policy*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, pp. 193–215.

Weiss, M. A. 1980. The origins and legacy of urban renewal. In Clavel, P., Forester, J., and Goldsmith, W. W., eds., *Urban and Regional Planning in an Age of Austerity*. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 53–80.

Wekerle, G. 2004. Food justice movements: Policy, planning, and networks. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23: 378–86.

West County Toxics Coalition (WCTC). 2007. www.westcountytoxicscoalition.org.

West Oakland Project Area Committee (WOPAC). 2006. http://www.business2oakland.com/main/westoakland.htm.

Wetzel, T. 2000. *A Year in the Life of the Mission Anti-displacement Movement*. http://www.uncanny.net/~wetzel/macchron.htm.

Wetzel, T. 2001. San Francisco's space wars. *Processed World Magazine* (fall): 49–57.

White, R. D. 2008. Trucking firms line up for ports' clean-air programs. *Los Angeles Times,* September 6. www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-ports6-2008sep06,0,5629082.story.

Whitehead, M., and Dahlgren, G. 1991. What can we do about inequalities in health? *Lancet* 338: 1059–61.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Whitman, S., Silva, A., and Shah, A. M. 2006. Disproportionate impact of diabetes in a Puerto Rican community of Chicago. *Journal of Community Health* 31: 521–31.

Whyatt, R. W., Rauh, V., Barr, D. B., Camann, D. E., Andrews, H. F., Garfinkel, R., Hoepner, L. A., Diaz, D., Dietrich, J., Reyes, A., Tang, D., Kinney, P. L., and Perera, F. P. 2004. Prenatal insecticide exposures and birth weight and length among an urban minority cohort. *Environmental Health Perspective* 112: 1125–32.

Whyte, W. H. 1980. *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. New York: Conservation Foundation.

Wiley, M. 2007. Smart growth and the legacy of segregation in Richland County, South Carolina. In Bullard, R., ed., *Growing Smarter*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 149–70.

Wilkinson, R. G., and Marmot, M. 2003. *Social Determinants of Health: The Solid Facts*, 2nd ed. World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe. www.euro.who.int/document/e81384.pdf.

Wilkinson, R. G. 1996. *Unhealthy Societies: The Afflictions of Inequality*. London: Routledge.

Williams, D., and Collins, C. 2001. Racial residential segregation: A fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. *Public Health Reports* 116: 404–16.

Williams, D. 1999. Race, socioeconomic status, and health: The added effects of racism and discrimination. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 896: 173–88.

Williams, G. 2007. Knowledge, politics and health improvement: The role of health impact assessment. Presentation at the South East Asian and Oceania Regional Health Impact Assessment Conference, Sydney, Australia, November.

Williams, M. T. 1991. *Washing "The Great Unwashed:" Public Baths in Urban America, 1840–1920*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Willis, C. 1992. How the 1916 zoning law shaped Manhattan's central business districts. In New York City Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission, *Planning and Zoning New York City: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. DCP 92-03, pp. 1–19.

Wing, S. 2005. Environmental justice, science, and public health. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. http://www.ehponline.org/docs/2005/7900/7900.pdf.

Wirth, L. 1928. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wood, E. E. 1931. *Recent Trends in American Housing*. New York: Macmillan.

Woods, R. A., ed. 1898. *The City Wilderness: A Study of the South End*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

World Health Organization (WHO). 1948. *Preamble to the Constitution of the World Health Organization as adopted by the International Health Conference*. http://www.who.int/suggestions/faq/en.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1978. *Alma Ata Declaration*. http://www.who.int/hpr/NPH/docs/declaration_almaata.pdf.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1986. *Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion*. WHO, Geneva. http://www.who.int/hpr/NPH/docs/ottawa_charter_hp.pdf.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1988. *Healthy Cities Project: A Guide to Assessing Healthy Cities*. WHO Healthy Cities Papers 3. Copenhagen: FADL Publishers.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1989. *What Is Environmental Health Policy?* Frankfurt: The European Charter and Commentary. http://www.who.dk/eprise/main/who/Progs/HEP/20030612_1.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1995. *City Health Planning: The Framework*. Copenhagen: WHO Healthy Cities Project Office.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1997. *Twenty Steps for Developing a Healthy Cities Project*, 3rd ed. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1998. *Health Promotion Glossary*. Geneva: WHO.

World Health Organization (WHO). 1999. *Health Impact Assessment: Main Concepts and Suggested Approach*. Gothenburg Consensus Paper. European Centre for Health Policy. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2002. *Community Participation in Local Health and Sustainable Development: Approaches and Techniques*. University of Central Lancashire, European Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaign, European Commission, Healthy Cities Network. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe. http://www.who.dk/healthy-cities/Links/20010907.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2007. *Achieving Health Equity: From Root Causes to Fair Outcomes*. Commission on Social Determinants of Health. www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/interim_statement/en/index.html.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2008. *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity through Action on the Social Determinants of Health*. Final report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Geneva: WHO. www.who.int/social_determinants/final_report/en/index.html.

Wynne, B. 2003. Seasick on the third wave? Subverting the hegemony of propositionalism. *Social Studies of Science* 33: 401–17.

Yarne, M. 2000. Conformity as catalyst: Environmental Defense Fund *v*. Environmental Protection Agency. *Ecology Law Quarterly* 27: 841.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025

Yen, I. H., and Kaplan, G. A. 1999. Neighborhood social environment and risk of death: Multilevel evidence from the Alameda County Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 149: 898–907.

Yen, I. H., and Syme, S. L. 1999. The social environment and health: A discussion of the epidemiologic literature. *Annual Review of Public Health* 20: 287–308.

Yiftachel, O., and Huxley, M. 2000. Debating dominance and relevance: Notes on the "communicative turn" in planning theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(4): 907–13.

Young, O. 1996. Rights, rules, and resources in international society. In Hanna, S., Folke, C., and Maler, K., eds., *Rights to Nature: Ecological, Economic, Cultural, and Political Principles of Institutions for the Environment*. Washington, DC: Island Press, pp. 245–64.

Young, T. K. 2006. *Population Health: Concepts and Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zima, B. T., Wells, K. B., and Freeman, H. E. 1999. Emotional and behavioral problems and severe academic delays among sheltered homeless children in Los Angeles County. *American Journal of Public Health* 84: 260–64.

Downloaded from http://direct.mit.edu/books/monograph/3164/bookpreview-pdf/2430696 by guest on 18 May 2025