CONFERENCES FEATURE:
URBAN CASCADIA

Ryan Centner
London School of Economics

For those of you attending the Seattle annual meetings: Welcome to the northwestern edge of the Americas – “Cascadia” – a region I am proud to call home, even though I currently live some 5,000 miles away in an increasingly provincial archipelago known as the British Isles. If this is your first encounter with the Pacific Northwest, you may be scratching your head. What is Cascadia? And how can someone so far away still consider it “home”? I aim to answer these questions while briefly conveying some of the distinctive features that define the three largest Northwestern cities of Vancouver, Seattle, and Portland (see map in Figure 1), including innovations and inequalities. Cascadia, to begin, is a somewhat contested term (Helm 1993; Smith 2008; Abbott 2009). As a regional moniker, clearly it references the Cascade Range of mountains that run from northern California up to southern British Columbia. Its vernacular origins derive from popular depictions of the Pacific Northwest as a kind of “ecotopia” (Callenbach 1975; Garreau 1981), reflecting both a unique landscape and unusual society-environment relationship. Seattle-based sociologist David McCloskey (1988: n.p.) developed the notion of a cross-border bioregion, noting that:

Cascadia is a land rooted in the very bones of the earth, and animated by the turnings of sea and sky, the mid-latitude wash of winds and waters. As a distinct region, Cascadia arises from both a natural integrity (e.g., landforms and earth-plates, weather patterns and ocean currents, flora, fauna, watersheds, etc.) and a sociocultural unity (e.g., native cultures, a shared history and destiny).

Beyond these early reflections, the idea of Cascadia has been further developed along po
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Chair’s Message
Kevin Fox Gotham, Tulane University

We have a fantastic ASA meeting coming up in Seattle in August. I hope everyone has made plans to attend. The newsletter includes information about the CUSS Sessions at the ASA meeting, as well as award winners and election results for section officers held this spring. I want to express my thanks and appreciation to a number of CUSS members who have given much of time and effort to support the section. First, I would like to offer a special thank you to
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Nicole Marwell for serving as Chair of the Nominations Committee. Nicole handled all the logistical tasks of contacting people and we really appreciate her hard work and effort at making the elections successful. Please join in welcoming the new section officers that are listed in the Newsletter. I want to give a big thank you to everyone who accepted the nomination to run for office. On behalf of the section, we appreciate your willingness to serve the section.

I want to thank our section session organizers: Joe Galaskiewicz for serving as organizer of the Session on Urban Spatial Inequality; Nicole Marwell and Michael McQuarrie for serving as organizers of the Session on Transformations in Contemporary Urban Governance; and Rachael Woldoff for serving as organizer of the Session on Crime, Disorder, and the City. I also want to thank Meredith Greif for kindly offering to take the lead in organizing the roundtables. The number of CUSS roundtables has grown in recent years at the ASA meetings, a sign of increased interest in the topics and themes of urban and community sociology.

A big thank you to the members of our CUSS award committees. For the Robert and Helen Lynd Career - Lifetime Achievement Award, I want to thank Miriam Greenberg (chair), Emily Molina, and Miranda Martinez. For the Jane Adams Award for Best Article, thank you to Josh Pacewicz (chair), Chase Billingham, and Jonathan Wynn. For the Robert E. Park Award for Best Book, I wish to thank Patrick Sharkey (chair), Patricia Herzog, and Rory Kramer. For the Student Paper Award, thank you to Shelley Kimelberg (chair), Marco Garrido, Jean Beaman, and Pamela Pricket. The award winners are listed in this issue of the Newsletter. Many thanks to those who submitted their excellent work, making the committees’ tasks both challenging and rewarding. Also, congratulations to the winners! The award plaques will be given at the CUSS Reception (6:30PM) on Saturday, August 20 at the Seattle Public Library. I want to thank Ryan Centner for leading the planning and organizing effort for our CUSS reception.

I want to thank CUSS members for voting to approve the two amendments to the CUSS bylaws. Let me give you some background and information about the amendments. Last summer, I had several conversations with past-chair Ray Hutchinson, chair-elect Deirdre Oakley, several CUSS Council Members, and others about formulating a set of expectations for members of the Council and members of the various CUSS Committees. There was some concern that CUSS Committee members and Council members pay CUSS dues and therefore should be leaders and decision-makers for the section. According to our bylaws, the CUSS Council has the “power to carry out all necessary operations for the Section. The Council shall make decisions by majority rule of its attending members.” Based on discussions, I developed and vetted with Ray and Deirdre a tentative set of expectations for CUSS Committee members and Council members. I then submitted a draft of expectations to the Council for their feedback. The Council approved the amendments with the final draft going to the ASA for their approval.

The ASA has an extensive review process for proposed new bylaws and amendments. The ASA Committee on Sections and the ASA Council reviewed the proposed amendments to the CUSS bylaws. After ASA Council approved the bylaws amendments, they were placed on the CUSS ballot for ASA’s spring election. As you know, both amendments received a majority of favorable votes. They went into force on the last day of the 2016 ASA meeting. Here are the amendments:

-Amendment #1: In order to give potential CUSS Committee members and Council members a sense of what is expected so that they can make a decision of whether they can commit the appropriate amount of time to join such a committee, the following are general guidelines that characterize the time and effort expected of committee members and council members.

Expectations of CUSS Committee Members. Accepting membership on a CUSS Committee means a full-year commitment to do the following:

• Perform agreed upon tasks as decided through committee
• Communicate and follow up regularly with committee chair regarding specific tasks, needs and requests
• Report progress of tasks as requested
• Assist in recruiting new committee members and CUSS members generally
• Attend ASA meeting and CUSS Business Meeting
• Attend CUSS events, especially CUSS reception

Expectations of CUSS Council Members. Accepting membership on the CUSS Council means a three-year commitment to do the following:

• Perform agreed upon tasks as decided through committee
• Communicate and follow up regularly with committee chair regarding specific tasks, needs and requests
• Report progress of tasks as requested
• Assist in recruiting new committee members and CUSS members generally
• Attend annual ASA meeting each year of the three-year term
• Attend CUSS Council, CUSS Business Meeting, and other CUSS events, especially CUSS reception each year of the three-year term

Amendment #2: There shall be a Membership Committee to identify strategies to retain current members and recruit new members. The Membership Committee will have three members. The chair of the Membership Committee will be elected for a three-year term. The other two members will be appointed by the CUSS Section Chair with input from the CUSS Council and the chair of the Membership Committee. The two appointed members will serve a one-year term, renewable annually. The elected chair member may not concurrently serve as a member of the CUSS Council, nor be another officer of the section.

The election of Membership Committee members will take place in 2017, the year after the amendment to the bylaws was approved. We need a Committee that has specific responsibility for reaching out to current members to sustain their membership and participation, and adopting specific strategies to recruit new members.

You may have heard that Judith Friedman, long-time manager of the COMM_R21 Listserv has retired. Back in the fall, I talked with Ray Hutchison, Deirdre Oakley, and several others about a successor. There is no formal process of nomination for the listserv since it is not owned and controlled by the ASA. It is important that whoever manages the listserv be someone who is an active member of CUSS and is collegial and understands the importance of monitoring and enforcing listerv etiquette. We are happy that Deirdre Oakley eagerly volunteered to take Judith’s place and manage the listserv. I thank CUSS Council Members for their support and endorsement of Deirdre’s leadership and management of the COMM_R21 Listserv.

There has been some discussion over the past year about developing a set of listerv rules, guidelines, and etiquette. The ASA has their own guidelines and rules of etiquette regarding listerv behavior. The CUSS Council may want to adopt or promulgate some guidelines and rules of etiquette for the COMM_R21 Listserv. Anyway, let me know if you have any thoughts and opinions. We can discuss at the ASA meeting.

Finally, please consider sharing your excitement about CUSS with your colleagues and students. Here is a link to gift membership if you are feeling particularly generous http://asa.enoah.com/Home/My-ASA/Gift-Section (the page will prompt you to log in). Once in the system, you can choose CUSS, then search the ASA member database by name. Only current ASA members (and those who are not already members of CUSS) are eligible to receive a gift section membership. You may purchase several memberships at one time, with an easy checkout and payment process within the secure ASA database. Section memberships will be activated immediately; recipients will receive an e-mail notifying them of the gift. Please consider gifting a CUSS membership to a few of your current students! We are aiming to increase our section membership this year, and we need your help. Members who join sections early in the year receive far more benefit from their memberships than those who are added later in the year. These members have more of an opportunity to engaged with the section’s activities during the year and participate at the Annual Meeting. Consequently they are more likely to stay active after the current membership year.

That is all for now. I hope to see everyone at the ASA meeting and at the CUSS reception.

EDITOR’S NOTE
William G. Holt
Birmingham-Southern College

As the 2016 ASA Annual Meetings approach, the CUSS Section will be offering an exciting set of panels and roundtables. Unfortunately, since the ASA scheduled the meetings at the end of August, many of us will not be able to attend due to required beginning of term responsibilities at our home institutions. This is the second year many of us missed the annual meetings due to this scheduling choice. With the ASA reviewing future annual meeting dates, I hope they will return to earlier August meeting dates that were previously selected in other years. Congratulations to the winners of the 2016 CUSS Section elections and thanks to all who stood for election.

As I prepare for the CUSS Newsletter’s three editions for 2016-17 please send me your ideas for features and stories to wholt@bsc.edu.
CALLS FOR SUBMISSIONS

● ASA Rose Series in Sociology—Call for Submissions—a book series published by the Russell Sage Foundation, is seeking book proposals. The Rose Series publishes cutting-edge, highly visible, and accessible books that offer synthetic analyses of existing fields, challenge prevailing paradigms, and/or offer fresh views on enduring controversies. Books published in the Series reach a broad audience of sociologists, other social scientists, and policymakers. Please submit a 1-page summary and CV to: Lee Clarke, rose.series@socology.rutgers.edu. For more information, visit http://www.asanet.org/research-publications.

● Research in Urban Sociology, Volume 16: Urban Theory, edited by Ryan Centner, London School of Economics—Call for submissions: Urban sociology and particularly its theoretical aspects have witnessed major shifts over the decades, whether renaissances or existential crises, new trajectories or substantive revisits. After a century of urban sociology, the subfield is strikingly diverse in content, focus, and vision; urban sociologists have proven to be especially omnivorous in their work, perhaps responding to the sheer complexity and heterogeneity of the research object that unifies them—the city. But what has happened to theory in this endeavor as we confront a vast world of cities?

  For example, sociologists have been strangely absent from recent debates about “postcolonial urbanism,” “planetary urbanization,” and “comparative urban studies.” How can urban sociologists weigh in here? What sort of distinct, disciplinary intervention can we offer in these current quarrels over urban theory?

  Beyond those debates, what is urban about the cutting edge of our theories? And where are our theories—which places figure in our frameworks, and why?

This volume, “Urban Theory,” seeks papers broaching these questions and representing the breadth of theory in urban sociology today. Please send a 500-700 word summary abstract of your potential contribution to the volume editor, Ryan Centner, at r.o.centner@lse.ac.uk. Abstracts are due August 30, 2016 and a full manuscript draft is due by January 15, 2017, with expected publication in Fall 2017. Please send submissions as PDFs, with “URBAN THEORY” at the beginning of your email subject line. The edited volume will comprise Volume 16 of the series Research in Urban Sociology, published by Emerald Press.

NEWS & NOTES

● Lazarus Adua, University of Northern Iowa and Linda Lobao, Ohio State University, recently published "Business Attraction and Redistribution by U.S. Local Governments: To What Extent is there a Zero-Sum Relationship between Business and Citizens' Interests?” in State and Local Government Review. 8 February 2016.

● Terry Nichols Clark, University of Chicago, announces the Building Arts Scenes for Cultural Placemaking, Program for a Week of Conversations June 18 to 24, 2016; The University of Chicago; organized with Daniel Aaron Silver has an online summary of Power Points and draft papers for the sessions are at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ik5trei9pe4ci/AAABaOlj8s5ru5Zp8bpD6RSA?dl=0. Other information is available at http://neubauercollege.uchicago.edu/faculty/art_scenes/ as well as http://www.tnc-newsletter.blogspot.com/ and http://scenes-capes.weebly.com. These three sites have links to videos and publications.

● Suzanne Hall has been appointed as the incoming Director of the Cities Programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science. The Cities Programme is the graduate education branch of the LSE Cities research centre hosted by the Department of Sociology, and offers both an MSc in City Design and Social Science, and a PhD programme. Suzanne takes over from Professor Fran Tonkiss. Also, she has a new publication with Julia King and Robin Finlay (2016) ‘Migrant Infrastructure: Transaction economies in Birmingham and Leicester, UK’, Urban Studies, pp. 1-17, Early View DOI 10.1177/0042098016634586.
NEW DISSERTATIONS

- **Going it Alone: Legal Mobilization and Efficacy in the Foreclosure Crisis**  
  - Emily S. Taylor Poppe  
  - Cornell University  
  - Erin York Cornwell, advisor  
  
  This dissertation evaluates the judicial foreclosure process as a source of inequality during and after the Economic Crisis. Using an original dataset of a representative random sample of 955 foreclosure cases initiated in New York City between 2007 and 2011, she finds that legislative reforms that increased homeowner participation and court intervention in the process were more consequential for individual case outcomes than the use of lawyers. This work contributes to existing research on housing policy, inequalities in mortgage lending and default, as well as legal behavior and access to justice. She will be a Visiting Assistant Professor at Cornell Law School.

- **Residential Segregation and Health Outcomes: The Role of Health-Promoting Community Organizations in Urban Neighborhoods**  
  - Kathryn Freeman Anderson  
  - University of Arizona, 2016  
  - Joseph Galaskiewicz, Advisor  
  
  This dissertation analyzes the relationship between racial/ethnic residential segregation and health and health care outcomes. In particular, it examines how the distribution of health-related community organizations and service providers across communities as an explanatory factor in understanding the segregation-health link. Using nation-wide data on organizations in a national analysis, combined with an in-depth analysis of the Phoenix urbanized area, this dissertation finds that health-related community organizations are not equally distributed across residential space, with minority neighborhoods being less likely to have a variety of such facilities. These findings span a number of different types of health resources, including food sources, physical fitness facilities, health care organizations, civic associations, and social services. Further, in a study of families’ health care utilization across the Phoenix area, it finds that the unequal distribution of such facilities is consequential for the residents of segregated areas, even net of their personal and area-level economic resources. Overall, the dissertation demonstrates that segregation is related to an unequal distribution of health-related establishments across urban space, and that this inequity patterns the utilization behaviors of those residents. This fall she will be an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Houston.

Judith R. Halasz
State University of New York, New Paltz

In The Bohemian Ethos: Questioning Work and Making a Scene on the Lower East Side (Routledge, 2015; http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415854399/), Judith R. Halasz examines the creative, political, economic, cultural, and social impact of the Beats, the counterculture, the underground, indie, and punk scene, and more recent generations of bohemians living on the Lower East Side of New York. Weaving together historical-comparative research, ethnography, and her experiences of having been raised amidst downtown New York’s bohemian communities, Halasz deciphers bohemians’ unconventional behaviors, creative output, and attitudes towards employment and the broader work world. For generations, bohemians have inflicted their self-marginalization and un-conventionality with a distinct ethos; specifically, bohemians typically limit their time and commitment to paid work to the minimum necessary for subsistence in order to pursue self-generated, often unpaid, artistic, intellectual, or political activities. Despite bohemians’ self-distancing from the market, their subcultural appeal is often used to fuel production, consumption, and urban redevelopment, ironically undermining the conditions necessary for a bohemian way of life. Halasz concludes that bohemians’ unconventional behaviors and attitudes towards employment and the broader work world constitute a politically charged yet increasingly precarious form of cultural resistance to hegemonic imperatives.


Christopher P. Dum
Kent State University

Residential motels have long been a place of last resort for many vulnerable Americans—released prisoners, people with disabilities or mental illness, struggling addicts, the recently homeless, and the working poor. Cast aside by their families and mainstream society, they survive in squalid, unsafe, and demeaning circumstances that few of us can imagine.

For a year, the sociologist Christopher P. Dum lived in the Boardwalk Motel to better understand its residents and the varied paths that brought them there. He documented how life in the motel affected their goals and dreams. As told through the voices and experiences of motel residents, Exiled in America paints a portrait of a vibrant community whose members forged identities in response to overwhelming stigma and created meaningful lives despite crushing economic instability. Dum witnessed moments of violence and conflict, as well as those of care and community. Throughout, he presents a powerful counterforce to the myths and stereotypes that often plague marginalized populations.

In addition to chronicling daily life at the Boardwalk, Dum also follows local neighborhood efforts to shut the establishment down, leading to a wider analysis of legislative attempts to sanitize shared social space. He suggests meaningful policy changes to address the societal failures that lead to the
need for motels such as the Boardwalk. The story of the Boardwalk, and the many motels like it, will concern anyone who cares about the lives of America’s most vulnerable citizens.


-Michael Peter Smith University of California, Davis

For over three decades, urban theorist Michael Peter Smith has engaged in constructing innovative theories on central research questions in urban studies. This book brings together his views on the state of urban theory, sorting out the changing strengths and weaknesses in the field.

Smith refocuses attention on the cultural, social, and political practices of urban inhabitants, particularly the way in which their everyday activities have contributed to the social construction of new ethnic identities and new meanings of urban citizenship. Combining the methods of political economy and transnational ethnography, he encourages us to think about new political spaces for practicing “urban citizenship” by analyzing the connections linking cities to the web of relations to other localities in which they are embedded.

Smith systematically analyzes the dynamics of “community power” and “urban change” under new globalizing trends and increased transnational mobility. Expanding on his original conceptualization of “transnational urbanism,” he frames urban political life within a wider transnational context of political practice, in which an endless interplay of distinctly situated networks, social practices, and power relations are fought out at multiple scales, in an inexorable politics of inclusion and exclusion.

-Michael Maly Roosevelt University Heather Dalgama Roosevelt University

For many whites, desegregation initially felt like an attack on their community. But how has the process of racial change affected whites’ understanding of community and race? In Vanishing Eden, Michael Maly and Heather Dalgama provide an intriguing analysis of the experiences and memories of whites who lived in Chicago neighborhoods experiencing racial change during the 1950s through the 1980s. They pay particular attention to examining how young people made sense of what was occurring, and how this experience impacted their lives.

Using a blend of urban studies and whiteness studies, the authors examine how racial solidarity and whiteness were created and maintained—often in subtle and reflective ways. Vanishing Eden also considers how race is central to the ways social institutions such as housing, education, and employment function. Surveying the shifting social, economic, and racial contexts, the authors explore how race and class at local and national levels shaped the organizing strategies of those whites who chose to stay as racial borders began to change.
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litical, cultural, entrepreneurial, and even athletic lines (Pivo 1996; Sparke 2005; Smith 2008; Shobe & Gibson 2016). There is broad acceptance that Cascadia signals and encapsulates a few abiding, unifying characteristics: a place that is geographically peripheral, aesthetically and politically green, and self-contentedly different. Urban Cascadia—from Portland to Seattle to Vancouver—represents a particularly uncommon bundle of shared features.

Distinctiveness

Seattle is the largest city in this part of the world, with a metropolitan population of 3.44 million (US Census 2010), but its nearby cousins of Vancouver, British Columbia at 2.31 million (Statistics Canada 2011) and Portland, Oregon at 2.23 million (US Census 2010) are certainly not small towns. All three cities were founded following thousands of years of continuous indigenous inhabitation of the region: first, Portland in 1845 near the end of the Oregon Trail and growing as a port for agricultural output; then Seattle was incorporated in 1869, initially flourishing from a timber boom and as a gold rush gateway; and lastly Vancouver, in 1886, was incorporated as the terminus for the Canadian Pacific Railway and an anchor of development on the west coast. All three cities were built up to serve largely agrarian or extractive rather than industrialized economies. Over the decades, their economies have transformed several times. While they retain some key activities tied to the land, and did undergo industrialization to varying extents (especially Seattle, as the base of Boeing), these are now predominantly postindustrial cities, with technology and a variety of “creative” fields especially prominent.

With Seattle in the middle of this urban axis, each of the other cities is a 3-hour drive to the north or south. Despite a national and state borders, proximity bonds this urban Cascadia troika. This is especially clear in contrast to their shared distance from other major cities of the continent (San Francisco is closest, at a 10-hour drive from Portland; in contrast, non-stop flights from this region to the densely urbanized Northeast are only slightly shorter than air travel between the East Coast and Europe). Objectively then, urban Cascadia is peripheral; this edge location is a recurring, generally proud element of self-narratives about Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver (e.g., Sterrett et al. 2015; CascadiaNow! 2016). These places are far from DC and Ottawa, and they are not trying to be New York or Toronto or Los Angeles. Such a positioning makes it is impossible for urban Cascadia to fool itself into believing it is the center of the universe. It can foster, instead, an awareness of marginality, an appreciation of the local as both intimately place-bound and constituted through connections to elsewhere.

On the ground, urban Cascadia is obviously green. Visitors frequently comment they have never seen such intense, abundant green before. The verdant landscape owes much to steady if typically light precipitation through the winter months, and a temperate climate year-round. Evergreen forests—although routinely clearcut—are the natural terrain of this region. But green is also political in urban Cascadia. This is the heartland of the “Left Coast” (Gregory 2015), where progressive, environmentally minded politics and policy are relatively mainstream. There is robust opposition as libertarianism or traditional conservatism; some of this comes from within these cities, but much of it is centered in suburban and especially rural areas of the region, making for stark contrasts and precarious balances in politics at the state/province level in Cascadia. Neoliberal (i.e., markets-first) values are also embedded in many versions of ostensibly left politics here. Political categories aside, Cascadia is home to some of the most landscape-focused cities in North America. Nature literally looms large in these cities, with mountains (including active volcanoes) and significant bodies of water punctuating the green.

The Urban Cascadia region stretches from Vancouver to Portland.
terrain visible in Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver. Indeed, these features comprise the stripes of Cascadia’s unofficial tricolor flag, with green, white (for snowcapped peaks), blue (for sea and sky), and an archetypal Douglas fir as centerpiece (see Figure 2).

The natural environment – whatever its actual color – is a frequent point of reference in Cascadian cities, from pedestrian commentary about how “the mountains are out” (meaning the weather is clear enough for the highest summits to be visible), to widespread participation in wilderness-based recreation, to policies that actively seek to conserve or revitalize resources whether in terms of recycling or limiting urban sprawl or promoting public transport. Indeed, for North America, some of these policies where pioneered or revolutionized in Cascadia (see next section on “Innovations”). In surveys about resident priorities, Cascadians have repeatedly placed environmental concerns above crime and the economy (e.g., Pivo 1996: 347-348; Rutland 2016). These places are renowned as especially “liveable” year on year in various global rankings (e.g., Holden & Scerri 2013) – often as the only North American cities to qualify. By some counts, these are forerunner laboratories for urban sustainability practices, even if quite contested (McLain et al 2012; Lubitow & Miller 2013; Sterrett et al 2015; Goodling et al 2015; McClintock et al 2016).

Partly building on environmental superlatives, urban Cascadia has gained fame as atypical – both reflecting and shaping the local cultural realm. In the early 1990s, Seattle was the epicenter of the grunge aesthetic and the bands that spearheaded its sound (Bell 1998), serving as home base for Nirvana, Pearl Jam, and others. More recently, Portland achieved celebrity through the satirical series Portlandia, with an anthem announcing that “the dream of the ’90s is alive in Portland” – referring to the alternative scene centered in Seattle once upon a time, but also lampooning Portland’s urban milieu as “like an alternate universe…where the Bush years never happened” (Harris 2012). As Portlandia heads toward its seventh season, it pokes fun at local quirks but has thrust the city into a pop-cultural limelight like never before (London 2014; Wrotham-Galvin 2015). In a different register, the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver brought global attention to the image – if not always the reality – of Canada’s west coast metropolis as a sleekly designed, stunningly situated, cosmopolitan host city (Brunet-Jailly 2008; Edelson 2011; Hutton 2011; Kennelly 2015). Across these different modes of ascent into broader view, there is a consistent narrative about each city being different as hip, beautiful, and liveable.

By now these cities have been narrated as distinctive or “unusual” for so long that this has become an attraction – and not only for tourists whose curiosity is piqued. Each city in urban Cascadia has experienced rapid population growth over the last decade (higher than 10% in all three), largely through immigration from other regions of the US and Canada, especially among younger adults. While economic opportunities play a part in this scenario, these flows do not necessarily follow an abundance of jobs on offer, but demonstrate instead an elective affinity for a certain Northwestern lifestyle (real or imagined) that embraces nature, art, and alternative values. In the case of Portland, this has been apparent in nationally high rates of unemployment among residents in their 20s and 30s over the last decade, often attributed to new arrivals pursuing a distinctive experience rather than job...
prospects (Jurjevich and Schrock 2012; Cain Miller 2014; Cortright 2014). Portland’s self-awareness as an unusual context has become so commonplace that the phrase “KEEP PORTLAND WEIRD” is emblazoned across much of the city – both in celebration of eccentricity and out of concern that new arrivals ought to embrace such “weird” Portland traits rather than push it to conform with cities elsewhere (see Long 2013: 56-62; Fitzgerald 2016). While most cities now engage in some kind of branding and self-promotion, deploying local slogans and iconic images in the service of touristic and commercial development, the Cascadian version of this takes a turn. There is widespread local consciousness as different, and pride in that difference, which is apparent in official and clandestine or artisanal ambits alike (e.g., Heying 2010). It is impossible to miss how much these are cities in love with themselves and their uniqueness.

Innovations

Bucking trends – and setting new ones – is part of what makes urban Cascadia so in love with itself. From urban planning to the “creative” economy to locavore mania, these places have innovated for decades. Portland, the smallest of these cities, has perhaps the longest and most specifically urban history of innovation. While dismissed as beautiful but boring and aimless by Lewis Mumford (1938; in Artibise et al 1997: 151, 160) on a planning consultation visit, Portland quietly transformed in the last quarter of the 20th century, using techniques atypical elsewhere in the US, at least at first. Experiments rooted in the 1970s, but with lasting effects are, in chronological order: (1) Portland’s downtown revitalization, which diverged from a typical midcentury American urban renewal program and prioritized public transport intensification; (2) the urban growth boundary; and (3) metropolitan-level governance, orchestrating multiple municipalities and counties.

In 1972, the “Downtown Plan” for Portland aimed to enliven and expand the city’s central district, bringing greater flows of people and more activities than 9-to-5 office use, which was the planning fulcrum of “the Portland Revolution” (see Irazábal 2005: Chapter 5; Abbott 2011: Chapter 7). Rather than aiming to displace “blight,” a key emphasis was provision of inviting public spaces and improvement of public transport, first with density and quality of bus service, followed by inauguration of a new light-rail system in the mid-1980s – highly unusual for North America at this time, and virtually non-existent in cities of this size (Dotterrer 1987). In 1973, pursuant to state-level legislation, the first “urban growth boundary” in the contemporary US was established around the outskirts of Portland, clearly defining urban and rural land, and limiting uses for certain kinds of development in each area, and channeling denser settlement in the city, but open to revision – as it has been expanded numerous times over its 40-year existence (Abbott & Margheim 2008; Adler 2015). By the close of the formative 1970s, Portland also adopted a new scale of government coordination by creating the Metropolitan Service District, unprecedented in the US but underpinning a regional growth strategy and facilitating harmonization rather than competition between municipalities (Huber & Currie 2007: 715-719). Innovations in Portland have continued through the present, but largely within this framework: in particular, the massive retrofitting of transportation infrastructure in favor of pedestrians, bicycles, and proliferating rail-based network has occurred since the late 1990s.

Seattle evinces the most prototypical North American urban patterns among Cascadian cities. It was home to the world’s first suburban shopping mall at Northgate in 1950, spawning a model that morphed into an American norm (Clausen 1984; Crawford 1992: 20); it also was the first US city to claim federal funds for historic preservation, up-lifting the Pioneer Square district and Pike Place Market rather neglecting or replacing them (Artibise et al 1997: 164-165). By the 1980s, as physical and demographic growth continued apace, there were strong, broad activist currents that aimed to counter the feared “Los Angelesization” of the region’s development (Artibise et al 1997: 166), yet almost all efforts to innovate in public transport failed at the polls (MacDonald 1987: 192-193). One field where Seattle has successfully innovated is in its community policing program, becoming a nationwide model by the early 2000s (Reed 1999). The city around Puget Sound has fared much better at fostering entrepreneurial endeavors over the decades: Starbucks, Microsoft, and Amazon were all born here, going on to become massive, mainstream, global corporations. This has bolstered the area as a booming technology hub, fitting into schemes to create a “spectacular city” with an image of Northwestern developmental success that presents the image of sustainability – yet entails many exclusions (Gibson 2004; Owen 2015).

Vancouver, like Portland, has innovated in the channeling of its urban development, but with a far greater priority placed on design, and the use of megaevents. In what has been described as “the Vancouver achievement” (Punter 2003), the city has built with far greater density and height than any other North American
city of its size. A uniquely Vancouver aesthetic defines the city’s core, partly due to its hosting the World Expo in 1986 on the occasion of its centennial, and series of later developments (Olds 2002), capped off by the Winter Olympics in 2010. But more than simply promoting itself to the world, Vancouver has increasingly been host to the world – not just as visitors, but housing the largest foreign-born resident population in the region. Immigration is especially prominent from Asia; flows began from China and Japan a century ago, but now all Asian subregions are represented with sizeable populations of immigrants and Canadian-born descendants. This has led to several neighborhood clusters in the Vancouver region with distinct ethnic identities, although these are internally diverse themselves, despite vernacular names such as “Little Punjab” (Hiebert 2015). In a broader sense, while there are significant frictions and contradictions, Vancouver has innovated in remaking itself aesthetically but also socioculturally (Blomley 2004; Edelson 2011; Menéndez Tarrazo 2016).

Across all three cities of Cascadia, the tenets of “new urbanism” have broadly defined the ongoing realization of 1970s planning innovations in the region. Taking the form of compact mixed-used development that aims to foster neighborly interaction and discourage car usage through walking and public transport, this is a major feature of Northwestern planning (Ozawa 2004; Sterrett et al 2015). Some of its influence can be traced to the proliferation of parklets (former parking spaces that become miniature public spaces) and a range of other innovative public infrastructure (see Ozawa 2004; Banis & Shobe 2015). These elements, although far from uniform in their application, have been aggressively applied in urban Cascadia, placing the region on the cutting edge of some city-making (and remaking) techniques being rolled out around the world.

Another innovation shared by Seattle, Vancouver, and Portland has been the promotion of the “locavore” scene. This is especially about craft cuisine and beverage production, but it exceeds this as well – in the prizing of all kinds of local goods, businesses, ideas, and strategies (Fitzgerald 2016). This has been part of the flourishing food – and especially food cart – scene in these cities, underlining their status as innovators from donuts to whiskey to coffee (e.g., Heying 2010; Newman & Burnett 2013; Koch 2015), all within a frame of ostensible sustainability. Yet locavorism runs the risk of romanticization (Heying 2015), much the same as New Urbanism. These susceptibilities points to the need to look beneath the surface of this innovation and those above to understand more thoroughly the sociology of urban Cascadia.

Inequalities
The pristine image of Cascadia often appears too good to be true, and in some important ways it is. In particular, economic inequality has become significantly more pronounced in the region’s cities over the last generation. Racial inequality has a less straightforward trend as the demographic structure of each city has shifted in the same period, and earlier histories of diversity (including both its promotion and its suppression) continue to exert local influence. To be sure, inequalities intersect clearly with the innovations and overall distinctiveness outlined above.

Although all three cities are seen overall as economic successes in recent years – especially Seattle’s technology sector – there is a clear crisis of urban affordability across the region. This has resulted in significant gentrification, including some of the worst homeliness on the continent (Blomley 2004; Gibson 2004; Shaw & Sullivan 2011; Chen et al 2012; Moos 2014; Hyde 2014; Kennelly 2015). Despite the persistently green narrative of Cascadian cities outlined above, there are the region’s poorest residents are not able to enjoy many of the fruits of so-called sustainable development – whether through disproportionate exposure to pollution (Bae et al 2007); lacking access to public transport (McKenzie 2013); or other forms of striking unevenness in incomes and amenities (Butz & Zuberi 2012; Goodling et al 2015).

The ethno-racial profiles of Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver have diverged from each other despite shared origins as settlements with relatively large, homogenous white populations and comparatively sizeable indigenous populations. All three metropolitan areas are home today to more robust indigenous populations than most large North American cities, but this share is now decreasing. The white proportion of the population is also in relative decline. Vancouver is the most ethnoracially diverse in this set, with large populations of people of color (in the official Canadian lexicon, this is “visible minorities,” plus “Aboriginals” [“First Nations” and “Métis” and “Inuit”]) together forming the majority of the population – 53.8% in 2011. Within the heterogeneous Vancouver population of color, there are significant pockets of extreme poverty (Hiebert 2015); this minority population is predominantly Asian, whereas Latinos (1.6% of city population) and Canadians of African descent (1% of city population) are particularly few in Vancouver (Statistics Canada 2011), compared with US and eastern Canada counterparts. The large presence and relative wealth of immigrants
from Hong Kong and China in particular have not led to always-easy relations with white Vancouverites; tensions have been especially strong around priorities of residential development and construction regulation (Olds 2002; Mitchell 2004).

Seattle and Portland have significantly smaller immigrant populations, especially Portland. Both were disproportionately white as large US cities until the 2000s, having also – relatively – larger indigenous populations (US Census Bureau 2000). Despite the relatively small size of Portland’s African American community, it has been an important locus of mobilization historically (Burke & Jeffries 2016). Over the last 20 years, however, Portland’s neighborhoods have lost African American density, with analyses showing this is not so much about residential integration as overall population decrease and displacement across a range of neighborhoods (Shandas & Dann 2012: 16-17). Partly this is due to declines in public housing, especially via HOPE VI (see Gibson 2007; Sullivan & Shaw 2011). In contrast, the Asian American and Latino populations of Portland have increased substantially in number since 1990, and spread across more areas with greater density; nonetheless, Portland Latinos are overrepresented in poorer areas of the city (Shandas & Dann 2012: 17-19).

In Seattle, the African American population has historically been numerically and politically more robust (Singler et al 2011). Since the 1990s, however, while the population size of black Seattleites has remained steady, their relative wealth has declined due to gentrification and their composition has become more foreign-born, due especially to the influx of some African refugee flows (Balk 2014). Seattle’s Asian American and Latino populations have continued to grow over the last two decades, with Asian Seattleites as the largest non-white population in 2010, and Hispanic Seattleites as the fastest-growing population of color (Brunner and Mayo 2011). According to recent research, these shifts in Seattle have accompanied decreased access to quality education for K-12 students of color, especially African Americans (Oliver 2016). Asian Americans have relatively high household incomes by US urban standards, and are often on the positive side of gentrification scenarios in Seattle (Hwang 2015). American Indians in Seattle, with a long and influential presence in the city, face the most structural disadvantage as a demographic group, in terms of rates of unemployment, poverty, and homelessness (Thrush 2007).

These snapshots of change in urban Cascadia point to connections between the innovations for which the region is known, and its inequalities which receive less widespread attention. New urbanism (especially its emphasis on sustainability), rising economic tides, and locavorism can obviously all shape unique, inspiring urban places. Yet several lines of research show how Cascadians of color are significantly excluded from these forms of development: most basically, these are almost never geographically uniform in their rollout; not everywhere benefits from new transit-oriented development, not everyone can afford or physically reach new city amenities (Bae et al 2007; Podobnik 2011; McKenzie 2013; Moos 2014; Mills et al 2016). Nonetheless, important efforts are underway in some of these cities to rectify wrongs of the recent past. This trend – albeit small – includes a program in Portland to counter African American neighborhood displacement by returning former black residents to gentrified areas that were majority African American within the last generation (see Theen 2015; Tremoulet et al 2016). Such approaches could represent a new paradigm for urban sustainability that goes beyond simply shifting risk and hardship, as is currently the norm in Cascadia, in ways that are disproportionately detrimental to poor communities of color (Dierwechter 2014; Abel et al 2015).

Closing
Thinking about inequality and innovation together is important for grasping how urban Cascadia is a place with real challenges rather than a kind of utopia where somehow the prosaic dilemmas of city life have been resolved. This joint consideration is also paramount for finding new, more just solutions. But it is especially imperative in keeping all Cascadians – not just the stereotypical ones with hipster beards or lattes in hand or dressed for camping at a moment’s notice – at the forefront of our urban imaginations, whether for crafting analyses, assembling strategies, or forging alliances. Urban Cascadia has aimed at inclusion, at least in broad strokes. This is a part of the world that continues to attract rapid growth, and has endeavored to find solutions to that growth other than mere expansion. It is a place that has inspired many with its sense of identity, but from many quarters there has been a constant effort to push that identity to evolve rather than to cordon itself off. There is no doubt that urban Cascadia is in love with itself, in love with “the local.” But this is a very flexible category; across these cities there is clear sense that newness is welcome, but that respect and a willingness to prize and further uniqueness are required. For some people, once they have experienced urban Cascadia, it becomes more than a place on a map, turning into a state of mind, even a sense of home. So on my
all-too-rare visits back to the region where I grew up, where I first learned to think about cities and society, urban Cascadia is always beautiful, yet puzzling; it makes me think, but it makes me feel welcome. I cannot shake this feeling even as I write from so far away, in a United Kingdom that is, in the wake of “Brexit,” currently rolling with anti-innovation, pro-inequality, anti-welcoming sentiments, where the notion of “the local” is exclusionary rather than open-minded. The cities of the Pacific Northwest — shortcomings and all — embody a very different set of experiences and values. I hope you find ways during your time in urban Cascadia to discover these for yourselves.
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Climate Change, Trauma & Coastal Cities

Kevin Fox Gotham
Tulane University

Coastal cities are of intense interest to environmental scientists but are seldom addressed by urban sociologists. Chicago was the paradigmatic city of the subdiscipline for much of the twentieth century. In recent decades, New York, Los Angeles, and Miami have received much scholarly attention but not because of their coastal nature. Rather, they have been singled out for their status as immigrant gateway cities, global cities, or major foci for understanding larger globalization and socio-demographic trends (Dear 2002; Sassen 2001; Scott and Soja 1996). Few scholars recognize coastal cities as worthy of empirical or theoretical attention. Even with “a place for space” asserted in the discipline in recent decades (Gieryn 2000), the space of the coastal city has been left in a sociological black box. A general neglect is in itself not a good reason for taking new interest in any particular topic, however, as Rich Lloyd (2012) argues and demonstrates in his discussion on Southern Cities. Rather, I wish to argue that there is much cutting-edge empirical and theoretical value in turning our sociological lenses onto cities along coasts. In part, the justification is a matter of simple demography: coastal cities around the world are among the most dynamic regions in population growth, expanding at the expense of shrinking cities in Europe and in the Northeast and Midwest regions of the United States. Globally, 1.2 billion people (23 percent of the world’s population) live within 100 km of the coast, and 50 percent are likely to do so by 2030 (UNESCO 2009). At the same time, the ecological variety and unique socio-environmental conditions of coastal cities – gulf cities, oceanic cities, deltaic cities, inland sea cities, and so on - mean that coastal cities take shape in ways not well explained by putative urban paradigms or standard models of urban morphology generated by the U.S. Northern prototype.

Rapid land expansion, intense urban population growth, and climate change driven sea-level rise are fundamentally transforming social-ecological relationships between coastal cities and the global environment. Scientists expect climate change to cause accelerated sea-level rise with elevated tidal inundation, increased storm and flood frequency and intensity, accelerated erosion, rising water tables, and increased saltwater intrusion (Blum and Roberts 2009; Gonzalez and Tornqvist 2006; Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2007; Karl, et al. 2009; Stern 2007). Apart from climate change, predicted land expansion combined with increasing population growth in coastal areas could endanger regional economies, threatened sources of fresh water, and alter land cover patterns and ecosystem services (e.g., provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as flood and disease control; and cultural services such as spiritual, recreational, and cultural benefits) (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) 2005). “The scope, severity, and pace of future climate change impacts are difficult to predict,” according to the White House Council on Environmental Quality (2010, p. 6), but “coastal areas will need to prepare for rising sea levels and increased flooding.” Adding to the challenge of responding to these impacts, climate-related changes will not act in isolation but rather interact with and likely exacerbate the impacts of other non-climatic stressors such as urbanization, habitat destruction, and pollution.

Urban sociological research is urgently needed to identify the determinants of the vulnerability, adaptability, and sustainability of coastal urban ecosystems in face of global climate change and non-climate traumatic events. According to the most recent assessment of the U.S. Global Change Research Program’s (USGCRP) National Climate Assessment (USGCRP 2013, p. 880), many U.S. coastal areas are facing heightened vulnerability to sea-level rise, flooding, and hurricanes. Virginia Beach, Miami, New Orleans, New York City, and Tampa-St. Petersburg rank as the top five “most vulnerable port cities” to traumatic weather events. These urban regions are home to nearly 30 million people and their real estate sectors and port complexes are globally significant investment and trade hubs, with billions of dollars in public and private capital invested yearly. According to the USGCRP, more than 5,790 square miles and more than $1 trillion of property and structures are at risk of inundation from sea level rise of two feet above current sea level – an elevation which could be reached by 2050 under a high rate of sea level rise of approximately 6.6 feet by 2100 (Parris, et al. 2012). In 2010, economic activity in shoreline counties accounted for approximately 66 million jobs and $3.4 trillion in wages (NOAA 2012) through diverse industries and commerce. The process of crafting both policy and infrastructure to secure port facilities under the threat of sea-level rise and intensified storm activity will no doubt be cru...
cial to the sustainability of not only the five coastal cities, but also the United States and the global economy generally.

I want to suggest that the concept of trauma can be a useful heuristic device to theorize and examine the impact and concatenation of multiple stressors on coastal vulnerability to climate change driven sea-level rise. Trauma refers to extraordinary events, actions or processes that can result in interlinked social and ecological transformations. Trauma can also represent multiple global as well as local stressors including those associated with sea-level rise, impacts of globalization and economic crises, and extreme events such as storms and flooding.

Examples of non-climatic ecological trauma include local extirpations of land covers, subsidence, eutrophication, loss of biodi-versity, altered hydrologic regimes, hypersalinization of estuarine areas, excessive nutrient loading, and increased loadings of toxic pollution. Trauma resulting from urban development-related loss of coastal ecosystems can have enduring consequences on environments and human communities and includes alterations of land use, reinforced inequalities, transformations in human settlement patterns, and reduced resource availability.

Trauma can occur over short- and long-term time horizons that can be disjunctive or concaten- ed, where acute traumat-ic events such as hurricanes, floods, and heat waves, for example, can play out on backdrops of slowly evolving, chronic traumatic processes such as subsidence and rising sea-levels. At the same time, the short-term and long-term traumatic components of global climate change are producing a complex geography in which the differential impacts of climate change are being superimposed on dissimilar vulnerabilities. To add further complexity to the picture, climate change is occurring in a rapidly changing world marked by ongoing processes of economic globalization, largescale human migration, coastal urbanization, subsidence, and nutrient loading (O’Brien and Leichenko 2000). These human-driven processes have traumatic impacts and effects that are likely to modify or exacerbate existing vulnerabilities to climate change.

There is a growing need for research collaborations that can engage communities and productively cross boundaries of natural sciences and the social sciences to develop new understandings of the linkages and synergisms between the impacts of climatic trauma (e.g., sea-level rise) and non-climatic trauma. Scholars have long known that traumatic events can alter social and ecological systems and that climate change is increasing vulnerability for both social and ecological systems (Mastrandrea and Schneider 2010; Nicholls and Cazenave 2010).

Although scholars consider both climate change driven sea-level rise and non-climatic traumatic events as important areas for contemporary social-ecological research, few studies have considered the two issues together, particularly from the perspective of synergistic impacts. As urban sociologists, we should be asking novel and original questions within the theme of linked effects of long-term and short-term trauma and coastal urban ecosystem sustainability:

• How do different socio-legal regulations and governmental structures influence the vulnerability and adaptability of coastal urban ecosystems to trauma?
• To what extent do government interventions and responses across jurisdictional scales produce risks to human populations, and how are these risks distributed within and between communities?
• How do coastal policy responses to climate change and non-climatic trauma affect land-cover patterns and subsequently spatial configuration of existing ecological communities?

• How do socio-economic disparities interact with coastal risks to limit adaptation options in different coastal urban ecosystems (e.g., gulf, oceanic, deltaic, and inland-seas)?

Coastal cities and their ecosystems are ideal sites to study and understand the interactive effects of multiple climatic and non-climatic trauma since human populations are concentrated along coasts, and coastal ecosystems are increasingly vulnerable to a variety of stressors including flooding, tsunamis, hurricanes, and transmission of marine-related infectious diseases (National Academy of Sciences (NAS) 2003, p. 4; Stern 2007). Smith and Ward (1998) have shown that rising sea levels will raise flood levels, and estimate that the number of people flooded in a typical year by storm surges will increase 6 times and 14 times given a 0.5- and 1.0-meter rise in global sea levels, respectively (Nicholls 2004). The salinization of surface waters, the result of coastal flooding, also poses significant health risks to local populations and places local populations at greater risk of hurricane storm surges (Karl et al. 2009). Around the world, coastal cities like Dhaka (Bangladesh), Jakarta (Indonesia), Manila (Philippines), Kolkata (India), Phnom Penh (Cambodia), Ho Chi Minh city (Vietnam), Shanghai (China), Bangkok (Thailand), Hong Kong (China), Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia), and Singapore, among others, are at risk not just because of rising sea-levels but urban population growth (O’Brien and Leichenko 2000; Nicholls and Cazenave 2010; Hallegatte, et al. 2011).

This last point is important for urban sociologists. It is not just rising
sea-levels that pose a threat to coastal cities. Rather, expanding coastal development exposes increases the geographical size of the hurricane target. While scientists have documented the major ecological consequences of climate change (see McClanahan and Cinner 2012), the elective affinity among coastal real estate development and increasing coastal risk to climate change driven sea-level rise is vastly understudied, (for an overview, see Nagel, Dietz, and Broad- bent 2009; Norgard 2011; Rosa, et al. 2009; Dunlap and Brulle 2014). Government policies, socio-legal regulations, and other human behaviors and actions that drive climate change have enduring global consequences with local impacts that are often unevenly distributed across environments and societ- ies (Bagstad, Stapleton, and D’Agostino 2006; Camin and Agyeman 2011). Overall, disadvantaged individuals and their communities—due to the socioeconomic status, geography, racial and ethnic health disparities and lack of access to care—are likely to face greater susceptibility to storms and floods (Nath and Behera 2011). Moreover, the resultant frequency and intensity of impact from storms and floods that relate to a changing climate will differ across areas where they reside (Roberts and Parks 2007). As a result, coastal cities will require a variety of adaptive responses, mitigation tools, and sustainable development strategies to cope with a barrage of hazards arising from global climate and environmental change.

Climate change has both short- and long-term traumatic components. Changes in the incidence and intensity of extreme weather events—storms and floods—take place in the context of long-term and chronic traumatic processes such as sea-level rise, ocean acidification, and rising temperatures (Bulkeley 2013; Mil- lennium Ecosystem As- sessment 2005). At the same time, the intensity of destructiveness of extreme events follows patterns of coastal urbanization and real estate de- velopment. Thus, research is urgently needed to understand how traumatic events cascade across spatial scales and organizational levels to impact coastal systems, and whether there are structural properties that can amplify or dampen such cascades. We need to better understand how to and to what extent the existence of relevant thresholds or tipping points in system adapta- bility that can be system- atically predicted, and whether there are ways of reliably sensing that the system is approaching such thresholds. We also need to understand how social-ecological communities will differentially respond to direct climatic events (such as storms) and multi-scale chronic trauma such as sea-level rise. Additional concerns include how various forms of socio- spatial inequality may limit social actors’ abilities to perceive the consequences of climate change, and what factors shape human responses to perceived risks of climate change. Finally, we need to understand at a more generalizable level which social, political-economic, and ecological features of metropolitan areas enhance and which constrain their resilience and adaptability in the face of trauma? The ef- fects and consequences of climate change are not even and uniform. Ra- ther, the onset and sever- ity of adverse impacts of climate change will vary across coastal cities, depend- ing on site-specific conditions such as elevation, local sea-level sce- narios, the probability of major storm events, as well as rates of popula- tion and economic growth.
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A GLIMPSE OF SEATTLE

Ruth L. Love
Portland, OR

When the ASA meetings were held in Seattle for the first time, in 1958, the city had one skyscraper, the Smith Tower (anchoring the south end of downtown) completed in 1914. It was the tallest building west of the Mississippi at 143 meters and 38 stories until 1931. Despite the meetings being held at the edge of Puget Sound (on University of Washington campus), when I went to New York City for graduate school that autumn I still had to explain Seattle’s location to fellow students.

So much has changed in the ensuing years, with the City of Boeing becoming multifaceted, thanks partly to the 1962 World’s Fair. This event not only inspired the Space Needle but also led to all too many Seattle mentions in the New York Times. All this may have contributed to the emergence of Starbucks, Microsoft and other noteworthy enterprises and institutions in the greater Seattle area as well as changes in established businesses. An example of the latter is the Mountaineers’ Cooperative growing into the Seattle-based nationwide REI (Recreation Equipment Inc.).

The 1962 World’s Fair began as the idea of one energetic City Councilman. Since the Alaska-Yukon Pacific Exposition of 1909 was successful in drawing attention and population to Seattle, the thinking was that another fair would help with international trade, tourism and other matters. The 1909 exposition was held on grounds slated for the University of Washington campus, and some of its buildings were absorbed into the university. A similar idea helped shape Century 21 thinking, namely that the inadequate Civic Auditorium structure and surrounding area could grow into a lively civic center with a good opera house and other facilities, just north of downtown. By 1955, the councilor had generated much interest in this idea from council mates, and the state legislature which allocated planning funds.

The Space Needle, at a height of 605 ft. and the tallest structure west of the Mississippi when built in 1962, was probably regarded as the most iconic symbol of the fair. Yet it evolved separately from the 1962 event and the fair planning itself. The idea for the Space Needle was initiated by Edward Carlson, the chair of the Fair Commission and vice-president of a hotel company that grew into the Westin hotel chain. In 1959 Carlson dined in a restaurant located on top of a single-pole television tower in Stuttgart, Germany. The tower, built in 1956, is 712 ft. tall. This inspired Carlson to propose a skyward structure which led Seattle architects John Graham and Victor Steinbrueck to create a design that became the Space Needle (with valuable input from Graham’s firm). It was designed to withstand wind speeds up to 200 miles per hour and earthquakes below 9 on the Richter Scale; and indeed, the Needle has withstood what the elements have thrown to date. Graham also formed plans to have the restaurant on top of the proposed structure revolve, like the tower he designed earlier for a shopping center in Honolulu.

The Space Needle was a totally private venture since both Seattle and King County governments declined to support it, neither for construction nor land. In response, five major Northwest business leaders, including Graham, formed the Pentagram Corp. to purchase land and pay for construction. Carlson committed his Western Hotels Co. to run the facility and its restaurant. With the time needed to develop a viable architectural design, work out financing and find suitable land on the edge of the fairgrounds, construction on the Space Needle began April 17, 1961 while the fair was scheduled to open April 21, 1962. It did all fall into place with the Space Needle being completed in December 1961. And 100 year earlier, in 1851, the founding story of Seattle began when the Denny party landed on the shores of what is now West Seattle (a large neighborhood and public
beach park). One member allegedly said, “New York Alki” (Alki is Chinook jargon for ‘by and by’). With phenomenal growth in the technology industry (mainly in outlying towns and suburbs), the arts and population since the 1962 World’s Fair one could possibly argue that NYC Alki has arrived. But that misses aspects of the city that make Seattle a place unto itself.

The rain in Seattle is a gentle mist so I did not buy an umbrella until I lived in Manhattan where the rain is much wetter and harder. (Be warned, some years, rain arrives in Seattle the third week in August.)

At certain places in downtown Seattle, when the sky is clear, and humidity and winds are just right one can sniff the salty tang of Elliott Bay while enjoying a fine view of the Olympic Mountains across Puget Sound. One such place is Myrtle Edwards Park, about a 15-20 minute walk from the Washington State Convention Center, and bordering Elliott Bay. (Its site was recommended for a park by the Olmsted Brothers in 1903.) The park has 1.25 mile walking and bike paths, with views to the southeast for Mt. Rainier as well as to the west for the Olympics. And adjacent (southward) to Myrtle Edwards is the 9-acre Olympic Sculpture Park maintained by Seattle Art Museum.

The walk from either the convention center or the Sheraton Hotel to the parks takes one through the Denny Regrade, an area where a large hill was removed through hydraulic sluicing with “hydraulic giants” (equipment developed for gold mining in Alaska). This landscape engineering feat, the first of several in Seattle, was carried out over multiple phases, starting in 1897 and finishing in 1930. The sluiced-off hill soils were dumped into Elliott Bay, thereby helping form the downtown waterfront as it is known today.(6)

For a complete change of pace, into a non-tourist residential area on the east side of Seattle’s “waist”, consider taking the 11 Madison bus, along with swim suit and (hotel) towel, to Madison Park swimming beach. Catch the bus on Pike St. (a block from hotel) somewhere between 4th and 6th Ave. Although Madison St. is the only Seattle road which runs directly from salty Elliott Bay to fresh Lake Washington (on a diagonal instead of adhering to the city norm of following an east-west or north-south grid), the bus route is circuitous. The bus travels on Pike for several blocks, heads north one block to E. Pine, continues for several blocks to E. Madison, and then stays on Madison, (northeasterly) to end at Lake Washington (at 43rd Ave. E.). The entire route is about 3.5 miles, and depending on traffic, takes about 30 minutes. Off-peak fare is $2.50, peak-fare is $2.75. (Most likely exact change

Glimpse from page 19

Top Photo: Ruth Love walking on Madison Park Beach around 1968-70. Bottom Photo: Picket fence at 1524-41 E. but you cannot see the house. The two homes shown immediately south of 1524 include “McGilvra” cottage.
Madison St. was born when John McGilvra, a highly successful attorney and close friend of Abraham Lincoln, purchased 420 acres of land fronting Lake Washington in 1864. To access his property where he had built a lake-front mansion for his family, McGilvra paid about $1,500 to have a wagon road made connecting Seattle's fresh and salt bodies of water. In 1880, he platted his remaining property into small lots for sale or lease, stipulating that only "cottages" could be built—a condition that lasted into the 1920s, and set aside 24 acres with lake access for use as an "amusement" park. It is likely that McGilvra intended the cottages to house patrons of the park, and the area did become known as a summer resort area, and "tent city" on land still unbuilt. (While growing up in Madison Park someone told me that our house and all the others were built as summer vacation homes, something that puzzled me and I couldn't quite believe.)

The amusement park evolved into a popular summer destination by 1890, with piers, promenades, bandstands and capacious seating for concerts, "singalongs" and vaudeville acts. Other attractions were a casino and dance hall as well as swimming and boating facilities. In 1922, about 8 acres of the amusement area were transferred to the City of Seattle parks department that reworked the area into a public swimming beach with lawn, surrounding trees, and tennis courts across 43rd Ave. E. The "summer" cottages evolved into homes that could be purchased by families of modest means, enabling them to enjoy the luxury of a swimming beach within easy walking distance yet relatively close to downtown.

The road McGilvra created, once serviced by a cable railway and now the #11 bus, the area and the park he named in honor of the 4th US president, James Madison. Today's bus route goes past Seattle University, started in 1891 (at 12th Ave. and Madison), over some hills, crossing the obligatory Martin Luther King Way (old name was Empire Way). From about 20th Ave. E. to MLK Way, Madison goes through the northern edge of the historic Black neighborhood in the Central District (now the northern edge is part of Madison Valley, complete with merchant association). African-Americans began settling (and farming) in the area in the 1870s; William Grose was the first black man to buy property (12 acres) in the East Madison area, in 1882. Others soon followed, some buying their property from Grose. In the 1990s the African-American population in the Central District fell from about 51% of the population to about 32%.

Glimpse, p. 22

Above: A rare snow in Seattle along E. Garfield Street between 41st and 42nd E. showing more McGilvra cottages with some containing small second floors.
(9) Just past 27th Ave. E., on the north side of Madison, among the shops and restaurants, stands the Bailey-Boushay House, a hospice/care center for HIV/AIDS patients (both in and out), operated by Virginia Mason Hospital.

Between 29th and 31st Avenues E., at Lake Washington Blvd., the bus passes the entrance to Washington Park Arboretum (designed by the Olmsted Brothers). (10) Its 230 acres are owned by the city while the University of Washington owns the trees and plants of which many are used for gardens and botanic research. A Japanese Garden of 3.5 acres is at the south end (admission charge), and at the north end, canoes can be rented for paddling on a Lake Washington bay.

At 36th Ave. the route goes past Broadmoor, a gated residential area with golf course established in the 1920s, and into the Madison Park neighborhood. The houses along the avenues between 36th Ave. E. and 41st Ave. E. are large and quite elegant. Along 41st Ave., however, there is a noticeable change to the “cottages” specified by McGilvra. Also at 41st Ave. stores and restaurants begin to line Madison St.

Madison St. ends at the lake just past 43rd Ave. E. Get off the bus near 43rd and Madison, head south toward greenery, and find the paved walkway leading to the lake. Here, there is indeed a small city park of the same name, with green lawn, shrubs and trees, a life-guarded swimming beach and bath house for changing.

(The bus continues by making a left turn onto 43rd Ave. E., goes three blocks north to McGilvra St., turns left, to 42nd Ave. E., returns to Madison to head back downtown. The route takes you past a few more elegant homes on 43rd, and several brick two-story buildings comprising the Edgewater Apartments, built in 1940, truly on the edge of the lake at the end of 42nd Ave. Edgewater has spacious lakeshore grounds; recently a swimming pool was added. Now a one-bedroom apartment rents for $1,425 and a two-bedroom unit for $1,925-2050. (11)

At the Madison Park beach and lake-shore lawn, there is a fine view, on clear days, of the Cascade mountain range, across Lake Washington to the east. To the northeast, one might see Mt. Baker (ele. 10,781 ft.) but the view to Mt. Rainier (14,416 ft. ele.) in the southeast has become obstructed in recent decades with the building of lakeshore highrise apartments. One can get a glimpse of Rainier by swimming a bit beyond the raft.

The effects of McGilvra’s stipulation that only “cottages” could be built on the property he platted and sold can still be seen on 41st, 42nd and 43rd Avenues E., between E. Galer and E. Newton Sts, within an easy walk of the swim-
ming beach. The cottages were built with two or three bedrooms, some with full basements, on narrow but relatively long lots, allowing for both front and back yards. In the post-Microsoft era many have been heavily enlarged or torn down to make room for new homes. One example can be seen at 1524 41st Ave. E. My parents, well-practiced in frugality to afford occasional treats, purchased the two-bedroom bungalow for $8,000 in 1947 (with help of an FHA mortgage). In the early 1980s they sold it for about $90,000. It sold again about 2005 for $300,000. A high tech. employee bought it and proceeded to invest about $400,000 in remodeling the house but retaining its original footprint and some of its outward appearance, including leaded ornamental details on the front windows.

The spirit of retaining the Madison “cottage” look is also apparent in new housing. In 1998, at 1517 41st Ave. E. a two-story house was built in 1998, and sold in 2014 for $1,555,000. (12) But one underlying effect of McGilvra’s cottage stipulation namely that families of modest means could enjoy living in close proximity to Lake Washington is now gone. So Seattle has lost one aspect that helped make it unique.
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Top Photo: Front of house next to 1524 4th Avenue E in photo taken around 1953.
The 2016 ASA Annual Meetings will be in Seattle from August 20-23. The CUSS Section will sponsor three open sessions as well as roundtables. The CUSS Business Meeting will be on Sunday, August 21 from 9:30-10:30am. The CUSS Reception will be Sunday, August 21 at 6:30pm at the Seattle Public Library, 1000 Fourth Ave., Seattle, WA 98104-1109. The CUSS Awards will be presented at the reception.

CUSS Business Meeting
Sunday, August 21
9:30-10:30am

CUSS Reception
Sunday, August 21
Seattle Public Library, 1000 Fourth Ave.,
Seattle, WA 98104-1109

SESSION ONE:
Crime, Disorder, and the City
Sunday, August 21
10:30am-12:10pm

Organizer:
Rachael A. Woldoff
West Virginia University
Discussant
Marcus Anthony Hunter, UCLA

Urban sociology and criminology intersect in many ways. Though the claim that disorder leads to serious crime has been contested, ample research suggests that disorder is related to crime, as it is associated with other problems, such as lower property values, negative evaluations of neighborhoods, reduced quality of life, fear of crime, mobility thoughts, distrust of neighbors, and psychological distress. Some research suggests that disorder and crime are part of the diversity of cities and reflect heterogeneity and inclusion. This session seeks papers that examine the ways in which crime and disorder affect the urban landscape.

Presenters
• Broken Windows in the Cul-de-Sac: Racial threat and quality-of-life arrests in the changing suburbs - Brenden Beck, CUNY Graduate Center
• Does Public Housing Mediate Trust? - Kevin R. Beck, University of California- San Diego
• Investment in Place, Neighborhood Disorder, Social Cohesion and Informal Social Control - Alex Currir, Cornell University
• Priming the Pump: Public Investment, Private Mortgage Investment, and Violent Crime - Emily A. Shridar, The Ohio State University; David Michael Ramey, Pennsylvania State University

SESSION TWO:
Transformations in Contemporary Urban Governance
Sunday, August 21
12:30-2:10pm

Organizers
Nicole Marwell
University of Chicago
Michael McQuarrie
London School of Economics

Urban governance has been undergoing many transformations over the last 30 years. The role of private firms, nonprofits, and management consultants has expanded greatly. Philanthropies and government-sponsored organizations continue to play a large role. Municipal agencies and bureaucracies have themselves been changing. While urbanists now take organizations seriously as entities with distinct logics and productive capacities, theoretical development around urban organizations needs to continue, particularly to make sense of much new and emerging empirical work. More importantly, our theories of urban governance are dated and often describe institutional arrangements that no longer have the central role they once did, if they continue to exist at all. This panel invites papers that offer new empirical work on urban governance and organizations, as well as theoretical interventions that build upon recent work on urban organizations and governance.

Presenters
• When Garbage Trucks Meet Tricycles: How Unofficial Practices Frustrate Global City Plans - Dana Kornberg, University of Michigan

• The Administration of Hospital and Jail Overcrowding and the Illusion of Policy Success - Armando Lara-Millian, University of California - Berkeley
• A Seat at the Table: Organizations, Legitimacy, and Power in Urban Governance - Jeremy R. Levine, University of Michigan

SESSION THREE:
Urban Spatial Inequality
Organizer/Presider
Joseph Galaskiewicz,
University of Arizona

The objectives of the session are twofold. First, it will give a voice to various perspectives on spatial inequality within urban settings. Papers that focus on local cultures, urban institutions, spatial distribution of amenities, urban transportation systems, residential segregation, and federal/state policies would all be welcome. Second, it will showcase how the spatial organization of the urban community is important in explaining not only access to jobs and schools, but access to other people, amenities, and ideas. All too often spatial analyses have been limited to explaining housing prices or real estate markets; it is time to explore how those who live within communities interact with, are shaped by, and shape the built environment.

Presenters
• Like a Good Neighbor, Squatters are There: Neighborhood Stability After All the Windows
Congratualtions to the 2016 CUSS awards recipients. The awards will be presented at the CUSS Reception, 6:30pm on Saturday, August 20 at the Seattle Public Library, 1000 Fourth Ave., Seattle, WA 98104-1109.

• Robert and Helen Lynd Lifetime Achievement Award
The Robert and Helen Lynd Lifetime Achievement Award recognizes distinguished career achievement in community and urban sociology.

Recipient
Hilary Silver, Brown University

Committee
-Miriam Greenberg (chair)
University of California, Santa Cruz;
-Miranda Martinez
Ohio State University
-Emily Molina
Brooklyn College

• The Robert E. Park Award
The Park Award (formerly the Park Book Award) goes to the author(s) of the best book published in the past two years (2014 and 2015).

Recipient

Honorable Mentions

Committee
-Patrick Sharkey (chair)
New York University
-Patricia Herzog
University of Arkansas
-Rory Kramer
Villanova University

• The Jane Addams Award
The Jane Addams Award (formerly the Park Article Award) goes to the author(s) of the best scholarly article in community and urban sociology published in the past two years (2014 or 2015).

Recipient

Honorable Mention

Committee
-Josh Pacewicz (chair), Brown University
-Chase Billingham, Wichita State University
-Jonathan Wynn
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

• CUSS Student Paper Award
The CUSS Student Paper Award goes to the student author of the paper the award committee regards as the best graduate student paper in community and urban sociology.

Recipient
-Jeremy Levine
Harvard University
“The Privatization of Political Representation: Community-Based Organizations as Non-elected Neighborhood Representatives.”

Committee
-Shelley Kimelberg (chair), University of Buffalo
-Jean Beaman
Purdue University
-Marc Garrido
University of Chicago
-Pamela Pricket
Rice University

TABLE ONE: Neighborhood Development

-Table Presider: Theo Greene, Bowdoin College
-Organizer: Greenlining the Rustbelt: Participatory Politics and Non-Profit Governance in Flint and Detroit’s Master Plans - Jacob H. Lederman, University of Michigan-Flint

ASA, p.26
Reconsidering Frames and Structure in Community Participation: A Panel Study of Low-Income Neighborhood Residents - David Barron Schwartz, Princeton

Neighborhood Development Organizations, Machine Politics, and Neighborhood Poverty - Bryant Crubbaugh, Pepperdine University

Clarity of Context: Entitativity and Community Collective Action - Monica M. Whitham, Oklahoma State University

TABLE TWO: Conceptualizing Community
Table Presider: Bruce D. Haynes, University of California Davis

Defining Neighborhood Boundaries: The Relationship between Historical Designation and Residents’ Perceptions of Social Cohesion - Elaina Johns-Wolfe, University of Cincinnati; Richard J. Petts, Ball State University

Reputation as Resource and Constraint in Urban Neighborhoods - Jeffrey Nathaniel Parker, The University of Chicago

Predicting Respondent Precision of Geographic Locations - Emily J Smith, University of California, Irvine; Nicholas N Nagle, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Setting the Stage: The Use of Public Space in the Performance of Neighborhood Identity - Sarah Zelner, University of Pennsylvania

Dividing and Defending Ogden: The Intersection of Race Making and Space Making in a Diverse Community - Pepper Glass, Weber State University

TABLE THREE: Crime, Disorder, and The Reproduction of Urban Inequality
Table Presider: Jennifer Rene Darrah-Okike, University of Hawaii


The Criminalization of Youth in Baltimore Neighborhoods and Schools - Melody L. Boyd, SUNY-Brockport; Susan E. Clampet-Lundquist, Saint Joseph’s University

TABLE FOUR: Gentrification and Neighborhood Change
Table Presider: Robin Bartram, Northwestern University

More Than Just Starbucks: The Diversity of Chain Retailers and the Communities They Enter - Mahesh Somashekhar, University of Washington

Racial Hierarchy and Racial Transition among Ascending Neighborhoods - Ann Owens, University of Southern California; Jennifer Candipan, University of Southern California

Interlocking Spatial Structures and the Reproduction of Urban Inequality - Jared Nathan Schachner, Harvard University

Suburbia-birds as Central City Super-Gentrifiers: The Case of Second Homeownership in Boston, Massachusetts - Meaghan Stiman, Boston University

TABLE FIVE: Homelessness and Housing Insecurity
Table Presider: Meredith Greif, Johns Hopkins University

Constructing the Vulnerable Body: Authenticating and Documenting Eligibility in an Era of Housing First Homelessness - Melissa Osborne, University of Chicago

Targeting Only the Prime Downtrodden: A Paradox of Seeking Only the Vulnerable but Housing Ready Homeless - Curtis Smith, Utah State University; Leon Anderson, Utah State University

Inequity by Default? Metropolitan Foreclosure and Housing Market Dynamics - Thiago Marques, University of Washington

TABLE SIX: Immigration and New Diversity
Table Presider: Sarah Mayorga-Gallo, University of Massachusetts-Boston

Analyzing Rates of Seriously Delinquent Mortgages in Asian Census Tracts in the United States - Katrin B. Anacker, George Mason University

Foreign Born Population Concentration and Neighborhood Growth and Development within U.S. Metropolitan Areas - Matt Ruther, University of Colorado; Rebbeca Tesfai, Temple University; Janice Madden, University of Pennsylvania

Hispanic Concentrated Poverty in Traditional and New Destinations, 2010-2014 - Sarah Marie Ludwig-Dehm, Penn State University; John Iceland, Penn State University

Hispanic Diversity in Metropolitan Areas - Michael Martin, Pennsylvania State University; Barrett Lee, Pennsylvania State University; Matthew Hall, Cornell University

Consuming Koreatown in Los Angeles - Soo Mee Kim, University of Illinois - Urbana Champaign

TABLE SEVEN: Neighborhood Attachment, Social Cohesion and Social Capital
Table Presider: Gregory Sharp, University of Buffalo


Neighboring in Context: The Role of Dwelling Type in High-Poverty Neighborhoods - Sarah Seelye, University of Michigan

Neighborhood Change and Neighboring Social Ties - Savannah Larimore, University of Washington; Christian Lawrence Hess, University of Washington
ton; Marco Brydolf-Horwitz, University of Washington
●Dealing with Disturbances - Intervention and Adaptation in Finnish Neighbourhoods - Antti Kouvo, University of Eastern Finland; Haverinen Risto, University of Turku

TABLE EIGHT: Racial and Ethnic Segregation
●Racial Residential Integration in a Chicago Suburb: Which Housing Searchers make Integrative Moves? - Allison Suppan Helmuth, University of Illinois-Chicago; Deanna Christianson, University of Illinois Chicago; Rowena C Crabbe, UIC; Maria Krysan
●Separate Menus In Dallas-Fort Worth. Examining The Dynamics Between the Food Environment and Residential Segregation. - Ferzana Havewala, University of Texas at Dallas
●Neighborhood Defense Mechanisms and Implications for Racial Exclusion - Joy Kadowaki, Purdue University
●Progress toward Racial Residential Integration - Robert L. Wagmiller, Temple University; Elizabeth Gage-Bouchard, University at Buffalo

TABLE NINE: Urban Crises and Recovery
Table Presider:
-Josh Pacewicz, Brown University
●Risk and Recovery: Understanding Flood Risk Perceptions in a Post-disaster City, the Case of New Orleans - Kevin Fox Gotham, Tulane University; Katie R. Lauve-Moon, Tulane University; Bradford Powers, Tulane University
●From Myths to Means: Place and Organizational Processes in the Gowanus Canal Superfund, New York. - Orla Stapleton, Indiana University
●The Social Networks of Resilience: A Technique for Rapid Appraisal of Community Network Structure - Kyle Puetz, University of Arizona; Brian Mayer, University of Arizona
●Two Crises, Two Trajectories: Impact of Economic Crises on Urban Governance in Turkey - Tuna Kuyucu, Bosphorus University

TABLE TEN: Urban Planning and Governance
Table Presider:
-Robert Donald Francis, Johns Hopkins University
●Precarious Participation: Targeting Affect through Neoliberal Participation in a Public Housing Context - Ryan Steel, University of Minnesota
●U.S. Communities Social Services and Economic Development Policies: Prioritizing Business’ Versus Citizens’ Interests? - Lazarus Adua, University of Northern Iowa; Linda Lobao, The Ohio State University
●Food Deserts and Inequality: Challenging Injustice and Seeking Food Sovereignty in Three Rust-Belt Cities - Stephen J. Scanlan, Ohio Universi- ty; Sam W. Regas, Ohio University
●The Benefits of Thinking Small: Emplaced Inequality and the Material Politics of Pedestrian Infrastructure - Michael Owen Benedikts son, Hunter college
●Suburban Racial Segregation and The Right to the City - Gregory Smithsimon, Brooklyn College CUNY
ASA
CUSS Reception

Saturday, August 20
6:30pm

Seattle Public Library
1000 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104-1109