****

**URPL-GP 2631**

**Transportation, Land Use, and Urban Form**

**Class Time and Location:**

Lecture: Wed 6:45PM – 8:25PM

Location: 238 Thompson St (GCASL) Room 274

**Professor Zhan Guo**

Office: 105 E 17th St, Room 377

E-mail: zg11@nyu.edu

Office Hours: by appointment

**Course Description**

The course will introduce students to the complex relationships between transportation, land use, and urban form, the foundation knowledge for transportation planning. It has four components

* A foundational review of theories on the complex relationships among transportation, land use and urban form.
* Empirical evidences on transportation, land use, and urban form, such as land use impact on travel behavior and transportation investments’ influence on land value and use.
* Policy practices based on the transportation and land use connection, such as urban growth boundary, job housing balance, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), parking standards, street standard, etc.
* An examination of recent national and international trends that may reshape the transportation and land use connection, such as mileage fee, popularity of Uber/Lyft, congestion pricing, COVID-19, high speed rail in China or BRT in Latin America, etc.

**Course and Learning Objectives**

By the end of the course students will:

1. Understand the economic mechanisms (markets, theory, evidences, etc.) for each of the transportation and land use link.
2. Be able to assess the likely effects of different transportation and/or land use policy decisions, including but not limited to its theoretical ground and the (lack of) empirical evidences.
3. Understand the technical approaches behind the transportation and land use connection, such as data collection (on both land use and travel), analytical models, methodological challenges, etc.
4. Understand the holistic nature of planning as shown by the transportation and land use connection--it is a comprehensive, holistic, and context sensitive endeavor

**Course Readings**

Students are required to complete all required readings prior to the corresponding class session. The readings include planning documents from planning agencies as well as academic articles or books. A few are from the flagship planning journal, Journal of American Planning Association. All readings are either available online from Agency’s website or through NYU E-journals.

To access E-journals, go to <https://library.nyu.edu/> click “Journals” and type journal’s title in the search bar and click Go. If NYU subscribes that journal (in our cases, all journals on this syllabus are subscribed), it will show up as a hyperlink. Click, multiple providers may show up with different years of subscription from NYU. Please choose the one with the year where your interested article was published.

**NYU Brightspace**

All announcements and resources will be delivered through NYU Brightspace.

**Academic Integrity**

Academic integrity is a vital component of Wagner and NYU. Each student is required to sign and abide by [Wagner’s Academic Code](https://wagner.nyu.edu/portal/students/policies/code). Plagiarism of any form will not be tolerated since you have all signed an Academic Oath and are bound by the academic code of the school. Every student is expected to maintain academic integrity and is expected to report violations to me. If you are unsure about what is expected of you, *ask*.

**Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at NYU**

Academic accommodations are available for students with disabilities. Please visit the Moses Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) website at [www.nyu.edu/csd](http://www.nyu.edu/csd) and click on the Reasonable Accommodations and How to Register tab or call or e-mail CSD at (212-998-4980 or mosescsd@nyu.edu) for information. Students who are requesting academic accommodations are strongly advised to reach out to the Moses Center as early as possible in the semester for assistance.

**NYU’s** [**Policy on Religious Holidays**](https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/university-calendar-policy-on-religious-holidays.html)

University policy states that members of any religious group may, without penalty, absent themselves from classes when required in compliance with their religious obligations. Students do not need to ask the instructor for permission, but they may choose to notify faculty in advance of such an absence. Whenever feasible, exams and assignment due dates will not be scheduled on religious holidays.

**Student Resources**

Wagner tutors are available to help students with their writing skills. Please see details on <https://wagner.nyu.edu/portal/students/academics/advisement/writing-center>.

The web also has some good resources to help you write better. After you finish writing your paper but before you submit it, you can obtain automated readability statistics here:

<https://igm.rit.edu/~jxs/services/TestReadability.html> and some additional feedback here: <http://writersdiet.com/test.php> . Use these services to improve your prose.

**Assignments and Evaluation**

Class Participation (15%):

Students are required to attend all lectures, unless noted in the syllabus, and contribute to classroom discussion. Missing one lecture or one lab will result in a one point deduction until maximum of 15 points is reached. Please contact the instructor if any issues arise during the semester.

Weekly Case Study Assignments (40%)

There are 10 weekly case study assignments. Each student will work on four of them, so each assignment counts 10% of the final grade. The assignment description is posted on the Class Brightspace website. The final deliverable is a 10-slide PPT file. Students need to sign up their four case study choices at the Google Sheet shared by the Instructor. You also need to get Instructor’s approval for your case study idea before moving forward.

Each week 2-3 students will present their case study at class. The presentation should be within 10 minutes. Each student will present once throughout the semester. Please see the Google sheet for the presentation schedule.

Case Study #1 Density/Compact Development

Case Study #2 Diversity/Mixed Use

Case Study #3 Street Pattern

Case Study #4 Sidewalk & Bike Lane

Case Study #5 Street Standard

Case Study #6 Off-street Parking Requirement

Case Study #7 On-street Parking: Commercial

Case Study #8 On-street Parking: Residential

Case Study #9 Transit Oriented Development

Case Study #10 Congestion Pricing/Mileage Fee

Research Project (35%):

Students will form a 3- or 4-member team to work on a research project. The project can investigate 1) a particular land use factor/policy in a locality and its impact on travel behavior/outcome (car ownership, mode choice, trip frequency/length, etc.) or 2) a particular mobility factor (infrastructure, regulation, pricing, etc.) in a locality and its impact on land use/urban form in the short- or long-run. The research topic should be preapproved by the instructor before the team move forward.

Each team is expected to collect their own data (travel or land use) and conduct analysis, instead of relying on literature review. Please consult with the instructor on potential data sources for your research. The research project will be evaluated based on whether it offers new insights to the transportation and land use literature. Please choose land use factors/policies or mobility factors that have not been well studied before. The PPT file is the final deliverable. No need to write a research paper.

Please form your team from the Google Sheet shared by the Instructor.

Final Presentation (10%)

Each team has 30 minutes to present their research at the end of the semester, 15 minutes for presentation, and 15 minutes for Q&A.

**Learning Assessment Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Graded Assignment | Course Objective Covered |
| Participation | All |
| Case Study #1 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #2 | #1, #2 and #3 |
| Case Study #3 | #1, #2 and #3 |
| Case Study #4 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #5 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #6 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #7 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #8 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #9 | #1 and #2 |
| Case Study #10 | #1 and #2 |
| Research Project | #1, #2, #3 and #4 |

**Grading Scale and Rubric**

Students will receive grades according to the following scale:

(A) Excellent: Work at this level is unusually thorough, well-reasoned, creative, methodologically sophisticated, and well written. Numeric value=4.0 points.

(A-) Very good: Work at this level shows signs of creativity, is thorough and well-reasoned, indicates strong understanding of appropriate methodological or analytical approaches, and meets professional standards. Numeric value=3.7 points.

(B+) Good: Work is well-reasoned and thorough, methodologically sound. This grade indicates the student has fully accomplished the basic objectives of the course. Numeric value=3.3 points.

(B) Adequate: Competent work for a graduate student even though some weaknesses are evident. Meets key course objectives but evidence suggests that understanding of some important issues is less than complete. Numeric value=3.0 points.

(B-) Borderline: Meets the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Understanding of salient issues is somewhat incomplete. Numeric value=2.7 points.

(C/-/+) Deficient: Work is inadequately developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstanding of important issues. Methodological or analytical work performed is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge or technical competence expected of graduate students. Numeric value = 2.3; 2.0; 1.7 points.

(F) Fail: Work fails to meet even minimal expectations for course credit for a graduate student. Performance has been consistently weak in methodology and understanding, with serious limits in many areas. Weaknesses or limits are pervasive. Numeric value = 0.0 points.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Wk | Lecture (Wed) | Lecture Topics | Assignment Due (before class) |
| 1 | Sep 4 | Travel as a derived demand |  |
| 2 | Sep 11 | Density & Compact Development | #1 |
| 3 | Sep 18 | Mixed Use and Diversity | #2 |
| 4 | Sep 25 | Street Pattern | #3 |
| 5 | Oct 2 | Sidewalk & Bike Lanes | #4 |
| 6 | Oct 9 | Street Standards | #5 |
| 7 | Oct 16 | Off-street Parking Regulations | #6 |
| 8 | Oct 23 | On-street Parking: Commercial | #7 |
| 9 | Oct 30 | On-street Parking: Residential | #8 |
| 10 | Nov 6 | Public Transit & Land Use | #9 |
| 11 | Nov 13 | Congestion Pricing/Mileage Fee & Land Use | #10 |
| 12 | Nov 20 | New Topics: COVID 19, Uber, High Speed Rail, Hyperloop, autonomous vehicles, etc.  |  |
| 13 | Dec 4 | Research Workshop (meet at classroom) |  |
| 14 | Dec 11 | Research Presentation (3.5 hours) | PPT Due |

**Travel as Derived Demand**

“What Moves Us? An Interdisciplinary Exploration of Reasons for Traveling”, by Patricia L. Mokhtarian, Ilan Salomon, and Matan E. Singer. Transport Reviews 35(3), 2015, 250-274.

The Myth of Travel Time Saving, [Transport Reviews](https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ttrv20/current) Volume 28, 2008 - [Issue 3](https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ttrv20/28/3) and all follow up comments in Issue 6

Asif Ahmed & Peter Stopher (2014) Seventy Minutes Plus or Minus 10 — A Review of Travel Time Budget Studies, Transport Reviews, 34:5, 607-625, DOI: [10.1080/01441647.2014.946460](https://doi-org.proxy.library.nyu.edu/10.1080/01441647.2014.946460)

“No Particular Place to Go: An Empirical Analysis of Travel for the Sake of Travel”, by Xinyu Cao, Patricia L. Mokhtarian, and Susan L. Handy. Environment and Behavior 41(2), 2009, 233-257.

Bent Flyvbjerg, Mette Skamris Holm, and Søren L. Buhl. "How (In)accurate Are

Demand Forecasts in Public Works Projects? The Case of Transportation." Journal of the

American Planning Association, vol. 71, no. 2, Spring 2005, pp. 131-146.

Cervero, R. (2003). Road Expansion, Urban Growth, and Induced Travel: A Path Analysis. Journal of the American Planning Association, 69(2), 145-163.

**Density and Compact Development**

Gordon, P., and H. Richardson. 1997. Are Compact Cities a Desirable Planning Goal? Journal of the American Planning Association. 63(1): 95-106.

Mark R. Stevens (2017) Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less?, Journal of the American Planning Association, 83:1, 7-18, DOI: [10.1080/01944363.2016.1240044](https://doi-org.proxy.library.nyu.edu/10.1080/01944363.2016.1240044)

* “Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less?” The Answer Is Yes, by Reid Ewing & Robert Cervero
* Thoughts on the Meaning of Mark Stevens’s Meta-Analysis by Susan Handy
* Travel and the Built Environment: Time for Change by Michael Manville
* Driving and Compact Growth: A Careful Look in the Rearview Mirror by Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Uri Avin & Li Fang
* Compact Development Reduces VMT: Evidence and Application for Planners—Comment on “Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less?” by Arthur C. Nelson

DG Chatman. [Deconstructing development density: Quality, quantity and price effects on household travel. *Transportation Research A,* 42 (7): 1009-1031, 2008](https://ced.berkeley.edu/downloads/pubs/faculty/chatman_2008_deconstructing-development-density.pdf).

Radall Crane. The Influence of Urban Form on Travel: An Interpretive Review Journal of Planning Literature (2011), pp 1-11

Yan Song & Gerrit-Jan Knaap (2004) Measuring Urban Form: Is Portland Winning the War on Sprawl?, Journal of the American Planning Association, 70:2, 210-225, DOI: [10.1080/01944360408976371](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360408976371)

[Donald Shoup](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0739456x08321734?casa_token=6H2tmPAyPm0AAAAA:hYVYInGvQeUAA2M642NApaI8g4yFQ92KcS3zHz7ciwdpzSM4Ut6lMyft2h4SDsKvKhamzhRqTtUR). 2009. Graduated Density Zoning. [Volume: 28 issue: 2,](https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/jpe/28/2) page(s): 161-179

[Lincoln Policy Institute: Gentle Infill - Boomtowns are Making Room for Skinny Homes, Granny Flats, and Other Affordable Housing](https://www.lincolninst.edu/sites/default/files/pubfiles/gentle-infill-lla180103.pdf) (2018)

https://www.lincolninst.edu/sites/default/files/pubfiles/gentle-infill-lla180103.pdf

**Diversity and Mixed Use: Accessibility and Job Housing Balance**

Cervero, Robert, and Kara Kockelman. 1997. Travel demand and the 3Ds: density, diversity, and design. Transportation Research D 2 (3):199-219.

Levine, Jonathan, Joe Grengs, Qingyun Shen, and Qing Shen. (2012). Does Accessibility Require Density or Speed? A Comparison of Fast versus Close in Getting Where you Want to Go in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. Journal of the American Planning Association 78(2):157-172.

Jonathan Levine (1998) Rethinking Accessibility and Jobs-Housing Balance, Journal of the American Planning Association, 64:2, 133-149

Fan, Yingling. 2012. “The Planners’ War against Spatial Mismatch: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward.” Journal of Planning Literature 27(2): 153–69.

[Yan Song](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0198971513000689?casa_token=ew9D4eaGJewAAAAA:NKdVjMTIGJpq021fjc0_A9b7Ts9NrN1PwJ1pvESsu9YwwhcazLIhXsggfBrLziTjXFHOogk#!), [Louis Merlin](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0198971513000689?casa_token=ew9D4eaGJewAAAAA:NKdVjMTIGJpq021fjc0_A9b7Ts9NrN1PwJ1pvESsu9YwwhcazLIhXsggfBrLziTjXFHOogk#!), [Daniel Rodriguez](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0198971513000689?casa_token=ew9D4eaGJewAAAAA:NKdVjMTIGJpq021fjc0_A9b7Ts9NrN1PwJ1pvESsu9YwwhcazLIhXsggfBrLziTjXFHOogk#!). Comparing measures of urban land use mix. [Computers, Environment and Urban Systems](https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/computers-environment-and-urban-systems). [Volume 42](https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/computers-environment-and-urban-systems/vol/42/suppl/C), November 2013, Pages 1-13

**Street Pattern: Connection**

Peter Marcuse (1987) The grid as city plan: New York city and laissez‐faire planning in the nineteenth century, Planning Perspectives, 2:3, 287-310, DOI: 10.1080/02665438708725645

Barrington-Leigh, C and Millard-Ball, A (2017), "More connected urban roads reduce US GHG emissions." *Environmental Research Letters*, 12(4): 044008.

Barrington-Leigh, C and Millard-Ball, A (2015), “[A century of sprawl in the United States](http://people.ucsc.edu/~adammb/publications/Barrington-Leigh_Millard-Ball_2015_Century_of_sprawl_in_the_US.pdf).” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(27): 8244–8249.

Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Street Connectivity Guidance Document. https://lvpc.org/pdf/streetConnectivity.pdf

**Sidewalk & Bike Lanes**

Guo Z. 2009. Does the built environment affect the utility of walking? A case of path choice in downtown Boston. Transportation Research D: Transport and Environment, 14 (5), 343-352

Bader MD, Mooney SJ, Bennett B, Rundle AG. The promise, practicalities, and perils of virtually auditing neighborhoods using Google street view. Ann Am Acad Pol Soc Sci. 2017;669(1):18–40.

Susan Jia Xu & Joseph Y. J. Chow (2020) A longitudinal study of bike infrastructure impact on bikesharing system performance in New York City, International Journal of Sustainable Transportation, 14:11, 886-902, DOI: [10.1080/15568318.2019.1645921](https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2019.1645921)

New York City Open Street Program

<https://www1.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/pedestrians/openstreets.shtml>

New York City Plaza Program

<https://www1.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/pedestrians/nyc-plaza-program.shtml>

New York City Street Design Manual Chapter Geometry; Chapter Furniture; Chapter Programming

<https://www.nycstreetdesign.info/about/download-manual>

**Street Standards**

Guo Z and L Schloeter. 2013. Street standards as parking policy: Rethinking the provision of residential street parking in American suburbs. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 33 (4), 456-470

Eran Ben‐Joseph. 2004. [Double standards, single goal: private communities and design innovation](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1357480042000227799). [Journal of Urban Design](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/cjud20/9/2) Vol. 9, Iss. 2

Kuai, YW and Zhan Guo. 2017. Are Residential Streets in American Suburbs Too Wide? Evidence from a Consumer Preference Survey. Working Paper

Southworth, M., and E. Ben-Joseph. 1995. “Street Standards and the Shaping of Suburbia.” Journal of the American Planning Association 61 (1): 65–81.

Grant, J., and A. Curran. 2007. Privatized Suburbia: The Planning Implications of Private Roads. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design 34: 740–54.

Ewing, R. 1993. Residential Street Design: Do the British and Australians Know Something We Americans Don’t? <https://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/trr/1994/1455/1455-005.pdf>

Ewing, R., T. Stevens, and S. Brown. 2007. “Skinny Streets and Fire Trucks.” Urban Land August: 121–23.

NSPS (Neighborhood Streets Project Stakeholders). 2001. Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines: An Oregon Guide for Reducing Street Widths. https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/Publications/NeighborhoodStreetDesign\_2000.pdf

**Off-Street Parking Regulations**

Donald Shoup, The High Cost of Free Parking*,* chapter 2: Unnatural selection

Shoup chapter 3: the pseudoscience of planning for parking

Shoup Chapter 5: A Great Planning Disaster

Shoup Chapter 6: The Cost of Required Parking Spaces

Shoup Chapter 7: Putting the cost of free parking in perspective

Shoup Chapter 9: Public parking in lieu of private parking

Shoup Chapter 20: Unbundled parking

Barter, P. A. 2010. Off-Street Parking Policy without Parking Requirements: A Need for Market Fostering and Regulation. Transport Reviews 30 (5): 571–88.

Marsden, G. 2006. The Evidence Base for Parking Policies—A Review. Transport Policy 13 (6): 447–57

Guo Z and S Ren. 2013. From minimum to maximum: The impact of parking standard reform on residential parking supply in London from 2004-2010. Urban Studies, 50 (6), 1181 – 1198

Guo Z. 2013. Residential street parking and car ownership: A study of households with off-street parking in the New York City Region. Journal of the American Planning Association, 79 (1), 32-48

Manville, Michael. 2013. [Parking Requirements and Housing Development](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2013.785346#.Ujn5mD_NmAo): Regulation and Reform in Los Angeles. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 79(1):49-66.

**Commercial On-Street Parking: Meters**

Donald Shoup, The High Cost of Free Parking*,* Chapter 11: Cruising

Shoup Chapter 12: The right price for curb parking

Shoup Chapter 13: Choosing to cruise

Shoup Chapter 14: California cruising

Shoup Chapter 15: Buying time at the curb

Shoup Chapter 17: Taxing foreigner living abroad

Shoup Chapter 18: Let prices do the planning

Gregory Pierce and Donald Shoup, [Getting the Prices Right, An Evaluation of Pricing Parking by Demand in San Francisco](http://www.shoupdogg.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2017/06/Getting-the-Prices-Right-An-Evaluation-of-Pricing-Parking-by-Demand-in-San-Francisco.pdf), Journal of the American Planning Association, Vol. 79, No. 1, Winter 2013, pp. 67-81.

Millard-Ball, A; Hampshire, R; and Weinberger, R (2020), ["Parking behavior: The curious lack of cruising for parking in San Francisco."](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0264837718313620) *Land Use Policy*, 91:103918

Romain Petiot, 2004. Parking enforcement and travel demand management, Transport Policy, 11, 4, 399-411

**Residential On-Street Parking: Permit, Street Cleaning, and more**

Guo Z and P Xu. 2013. Duet of the commons: Impact of street cleaning on household car usage in New York City. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 33, 1, 34-48

Guo Z. 2013. Home parking convenience, household car usage, and implications to residential parking policies. Transport Policy, 29, 97-106

Epstein, R. A. 2002. The Allocation of the Commons: Parking on Public Roads. Journal of Legal Studies 31 (S2): S515-44.

Jos van Ommeren, Jesper de Groote, Giuliano Mingardo, 2014. Residential parking permits and parking supply, Regional Science and Urban Economics, 45, 33-44

Residential parking permit plans in 7 cities worldwide: a survey. Manhattan Borough President

<http://www.manhattanbp.nyc.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/ParkingZoneWhitePaperFINAL.pdf>

Resident Parking Permit Programs:

* San Francisco <https://www.sfmta.com/permits/residential-parking-permits-rpp>
* Chicago <https://www.chicityclerk.com/city-stickers-parking/about-parking-permits> including how to establish a permit zone <https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/chicago/latest/chicago_il/0-0-0-2646087#JD_9-64-090>
* Boston <https://www.boston.gov/departments/parking-clerk/resident-parking-permits>
* Philadelphia <https://philapark.org/residential-parking-permit/>
* Borough of Westminster in London UK <https://www.westminster.gov.uk/resident-parking-permits>

**Public Transit & Land Use**

TCRP Report 102: [Transit-oriented development in the United States : experiences, challenges, and prospects](http://worldcat.org/title/56417159). Part 4: Case Studies

Dan Chatmen. [Does TOD need the T? On the importance of factors other than rail access. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 79 (1): 17-31, 2013](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944363.2013.791008#.UefW-IX5s7B).

Daniel G. Chatman & Robert B. Noland (2011) Do Public Transport Improvements Increase Agglomeration Economies? A Review of Literature and an Agenda for Research, Transport Reviews, 31:6, 725-742

Ming Zhang, Barbara TH Yen. The impact of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on land and property values: A meta-analysis. [Land Use Policy](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02648377), [Volume 96](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02648377/96/supp/C), July 2020, 104684

**Congestion Pricing/Mileage Fee**

Guo Z, A W Agrawal, and J Dill. 2011. Are land-use planning and congestion pricing mutually supportive? Evidence from a pilot mileage fee program in Portland, OR. Journal of the American Planning Association, 77 (3), 232-250

Sumit Agarwal, Kang Mo Koo, Tien Foo Sing. Impact of electronic road pricing on real estate prices in SingaporeJ. Urban Econ., 90 (November) (2015), pp. 50-59, [10.1016/j.jue.2015.09.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2015.09.004)

Maria Börjesson, Ida Kristoffersson, The Swedish congestion charges: Ten years on, Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, Volume 107, 2018, Pages 35-51,

Givoni M. Re-assessing the Results of the London Congestion Charging Scheme. Urban Studies. 2012;49(5):1089-1105. doi:[10.1177/0042098011417017](https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098011417017)

Lewis Lehe, Downtown congestion pricing in practice, Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies, Volume 100, 2019, Pages 200-223

Bruce Schaller, New York City’s congestion pricing experience and implications for road pricing acceptance in the United States, Transport Policy, Volume 17, Issue 4, 2010, Pages 266-273,

**New Mobility: COVID 19, Uber, Automated Vehicles, High Speed Rail, Hyperloop, BRT...**

Florida R, Rodríguez-Pose A, Storper M. Cities in a post-COVID world. Urban Studies. June 2021. doi:[10.1177/00420980211018072](https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211018072)

Graham Currie, Taru Jain, Laura Aston,Evidence of a post-COVID change in travel behaviour – Self-reported Expectations of commuting in Melbourne, Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, Volume 153,2021,Pages 218-234,

Alejandro Henao and Wesley E. Marshall (2019) The impact of ride-hailing on vehicle miles traveled, [Transportation](https://link.springer.com/journal/11116), 46,  2173–2194

Kenneth Button (2020) The “Ubernomics” of ridesourcing: the myths and the reality, Transport Reviews, 40:1, 76-94, DOI: [10.1080/01441647.2019.1687605](https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2019.1687605)

Zahed Yousefi & Hashem Dadashpoor (2020) How Do ICTs Affect Urban Spatial Structure? A Systematic Literature Review, Journal of Urban Technology, 27:1, 47-65, DOI: [10.1080/10630732.2019.1689593](https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2019.1689593)

Aggelos Soteropoulos, Martin Berger & Francesco Ciari (2019) Impacts of automated vehicles on travel behaviour and land use: an international review of modelling studies, Transport Reviews, 39:1, 29-49, DOI: [10.1080/01441647.2018.1523253](https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2018.1523253)

[Tan Yigitcanlar](https://sciprofiles.com/profile/944635), [Mark Wilson](https://sciprofiles.com/profile/480274) and [Md Kamruzzaman](https://sciprofiles.com/profile/529747) (2019) Disruptive Impacts of Automated Driving Systems on the Built Environment and Land Use: An Urban Planner’s Perspective.

*J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.* 2019, *5*(2), 24; <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc5020024>

Zhenhua Chen, Yulong Zhou, Kingsley E. Haynes, Change in land use structure in urban China: Does the development of high-speed rail make a difference, Land Use Policy, 2020, online

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104962>.

Mark Wardman Glenn Lyons (2016) The digital revolution and worthwhile use of travel time: implications for appraisal and forecasting. Transportation (2016) 43:507–530

Zhu, P., Wang, L., Jiang, Y. et al. Metropolitan size and the impacts of telecommuting on personal travel. Transportation 45, 385–414 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-017-9846-3>

[Yngrid YC Mallqui](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2213624X17300184#!) and [DorinaPojani](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2213624X17300184#!). Barriers to successful Bus Rapid Transit expansion: Developed cities versus developing megacities. [Case Studies on Transport Policy](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/2213624X) [Volume 5, Issue 2](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/2213624X/5/2), June 2017, Pages 254-266

[Tianqi Gu](https://www-sciencedirect-com.proxy.library.nyu.edu/science/article/pii/S0965856418309844#!), Inhi Kim, [Graham Currie](https://www-sciencedirect-com.proxy.library.nyu.edu/science/article/pii/S0965856418309844#!). 2019. To be or not to be dockless: Empirical analysis of dockless bikeshare development in China. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice. Volume 119, Pages 122-147