



1.

## What metropolitan transport for Los Angeles?



Submitted by Forum Vies Mobiles on Mon, 04/07/2014 - 17:46

Mots clés

Politiques publiques

Inégalités

Transports collectifs

Aménagement

Développement durable

Discipline

Sciences humaines

Mode de transport

Bus

Métro

Visuel

Alt

Contribution ouverte

Activé

Activer

Désactivé

Ajouter le trianglesi ce contenu est affiché dans la quinzaine

Désactivé

Auteur lié

Lucile Waquet (Géographe - Urbaniste)

Jean Leveugle (Urbaniste - Illustrateur)

Intervenants

Lucile Waquet (Géographe - Urbaniste)

Jean Leveugle (Urbaniste - Illustrateur)

Texte

## Introduction

<p>Los Angeles - the U.S.'s second largest city after New York, with 3,792,621 inhabitants in 2010 - has become the symbol of the sprawling American city where luxury and misery rub elbows and the car is king. Congested six-lane urban freeways, housing developments as far as the eye can see and segregated neighborhoods are just some of the clichés about L.A. cinema and literature have helped perpetuate globally.</p><p>In reality, however, Los Angeles is an urban model that is both dense and sprawling — what Eric Eidlin calls “dense sprawl.”<sup>1</sup> Once considered a poly-nuclear city, municipal authorities have been trying to create a central downtown area for the past 30 years. Through the creation of a subway network and express bus lines, transportation policy supports this policy of densifying and reinforcing the center. </p><p>The policy, implemented by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO), has been at the center of a controversy due to fare hikes and divestment from the classic bus network, which is widely used by poor and minority populations. In the mid-1990s a users’ association, the BRU (Bus Riders Union), backed by researchers from UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles), attacked METRO in court, arguing that the policy was discriminatory and environmentally unfriendly. This battle, analyzed by Tim Cresswell in On the Move (2006)<sup>2</sup>, did not lead to significant changes in the institution’s transportation policy, even if it did have some impact, such as maintaining certain lines and improving the bus fleet (powered by natural gas, which pollutes less than diesel). .</p><p>&nbsp;</p><p>&nbsp;</p><a

href="https://fr.forumviesmobiles.org/sites/default/files/editor/carte\_des\_projets\_de\_metros\_e  
\_los\_angeles.jpg"></a><a

href="https://fr.forumviesmobiles.org/sites/default/files/editor/1.jpg"></a></p><p>&nbsp;</p><p>&nbsp;</p><p>20 years later the situation has

changed and the balance of power has shifted in favor of METRO, with the BRU being marginalized. However, the question remains: what transportation policy to develop in a sprawling city like Los Angeles? What place should the car have? Is it better to

<div class="logo logo-mobile"> <a href="https://fr.forumviesmobiles.org/">1</a><sup></sup><span lang="en-US"> Eric Eidlin (2010), "What Density Doesn't Tell Us About Sprawl", </span><span lang="en-US"><em>ACCESS</em></span><span lang="en-US"> #37, pp. 2-9.

</span>Disponible en ligne :

[http://www.uctc.net/access/37/access37\\_sprawl.shtml](http://www.uctc.net/access/37/access37_sprawl.shtml)</p><div

id="sdfootnote1"><p class="sdfootnote-western" style="page-break-before: always;"><a name="sdfootnote1sym" href="#sdfootnote1anc"

class="sdfootnotesym">2</a><sup></sup><span lang="en-US"> Tim Cresswell (2006), </span><span lang="en-US"><em>On the move. Mobility in the Western World</em></span><span lang="en-US">, Routledge, London</span></p></div>

Chapô

<p>What transportation policy to develop in a sprawling, segregated city like Los Angeles? What place to give the car? Is it better to favor the subway network or the bus network? And why - economic reasons (competitiveness, employment, etc.), environmental reasons (reducing pollution and fossil resources consumption) and/or social reasons (the fight against social and racial inequality)?</p>

Envoyer une notification

Désactivé