## DOCUMENT N: COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT COVER SHEET

See Course and Program Development Policy and Procedures for Instructions

### SCHOOL: LAW ☑ MSB ☑ YGCLA ☑ Contact Name: Cheryl Curdzio Phone: 410.837.4457

### DEPARTMENT / DIVISION: Law School

### SHORT DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL (state name of action item 1-20 and course name, code & number / program affected):

Addition of new course – Local Government Law Workshop

### PROPOSED SEMESTER OF IMPLEMENTATION: Fall ☑ Spring ☑ Year: 2007

### Box 1: TYPE OF ACTION

ADD(NEW) ☑ DEACTIVATE ☑ MODIFY ☑ OTHER ☑

### Box 2: LEVEL OF ACTION

Non-Credit ☑ Undergraduate ☑ Graduate ☑ OTHER ☑

### Box 3: ACTION ITEM

(check appropriate boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOCUMENTS REQUIRED (see box 4 below)</th>
<th>IMPACT REVIEWS (see box 5 on back)</th>
<th>APPROVAL SEQUENCE (see box 6 on back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Experimental Course 1</td>
<td>NOPE</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Course Credits</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Co-Requisite</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>New Course</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Deactivate a Course</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Program Requirements</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a.</td>
<td>UG Specialization (24 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b.</td>
<td>Masters Specialization (12 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c.</td>
<td>Doctoral Specialization (18 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Closed Site Program</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a.</td>
<td>Certificate Program (uglq) exclusively within existing degree program</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b.</td>
<td>Certificate Program (uglq) where degree programs do not exist or where courses are selected across degree programs (12 or more credits)</td>
<td>NO, 6</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Off-Campus Delivery of Existing Program</td>
<td>NO, 4</td>
<td>a, b, c, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a.</td>
<td>UG Concentration (exceeds 24 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b.</td>
<td>Masters Concentration (exceeds 12 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c.</td>
<td>Doctoral Concentration (exceeds 18 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Program Title Change</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Program Termination</td>
<td>NO, 10</td>
<td>d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>New Degree Program</td>
<td>NOQR, 3, 8</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Box 4: DOCUMENTATION (check boxes of documents included)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>N. This Cover Sheet</td>
<td>Q. Full 5-page MHEC Proposal</td>
<td>T. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>O. Summary Proposal</td>
<td>R. Financial Tables (MHEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Course Definition Document</td>
<td>S. Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Approval of experimental course automatically lapses after two offerings unless permanently approved as a new course.
2. Codes: a) Library Services (Langsdale or Law) b) Office of Technology Services c) University Relations d) Admissions
3. Letter of Intent is required by USM at least 30 days before a final proposal can be submitted. Letter of Intent requires only the approval of the dean and the provost and is forwarded to USM by the Office of the Provost.
4. One-page letter to include: Program title & degree/certificate to be awarded; resources requirements; need and demand; similar programs; method of instruction; and oversight and student services (MHEC requirement)
5. One-page letter with description and rational (MHEC requirement)
6. One or two-page document that describes: centrality to mission; market demand; curriculum design; adequacy of faculty resources; and assurance program will be supported with existing resources. (MHEC requirement)
7. Learning objectives, assessment strategies; fit with UB strategic plan
8. Joint Degree Program or Primary Degree Programs require submission of MOU w/ program proposal. (MHEC requirement)
9. Temporary suspension of program to examine future direction; time not to exceed two years. No new students admitted during suspension, but currently enrolled students must be given opportunity to satisfy degree requirements.
10. Provide:
   a. evidence that the action is consistent with UB mission and can be implemented within the existing program resources of the institution;
   b. proposed date after which no new students will be admitted into the program;
   c. accommodation of currently enrolled students in the realization of their degree objectives;
   d. treatment of all tenured and non-tenured faculty and other staff in the affected program;
   e. reallocation of funds from the budget of the affected program; and
   f. existence at other state public institutions of programs to which to redirect students who might have enrolled in the program proposed for abolition.

11. University Council review (for a recommendation to the President or back to the Provost) shall be limited to curricular or academic policy issues that may potentially affect the University's mission and strategic planning, or have a significant impact on the generation or allocation of its financial resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5: IMPACT REVIEW</th>
<th>SIGNATURES (see procedures for authorized signers)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. OTS</td>
<td>CIO or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. University Relations</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Admissions</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Records</td>
<td>Registrar or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 6: APPROVAL SEQUENCE</th>
<th>APPROVAL SIGNATURES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Department / Division</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Final faculty review body within each School</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td>5-17-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. College Dean</td>
<td>Dean:</td>
<td>5-21-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Provost:</td>
<td>5-25-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Curriculum Review Committee (UFS subcommittee)</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td>6-5-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. University Faculty Senate (UFS option)</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. University Council (see 11 above)</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. President</td>
<td>President:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Board of Regents – notification only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Board of Regents – approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MHEC – notification only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MHEC – approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Middle States Association notification</td>
<td>Required only if the mission of the University is changed by the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O-1: Briefly describe what is being requested:
Addition of new course – Local Government Law Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD Title:</th>
<th>Course # / HEGIS Code:</th>
<th>Credits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW Title:</th>
<th>Course # / HEGIS: To Be Determined</th>
<th>Credits: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

O-2: Set forth the rationale for the proposal:

The class will provide the opportunity for students to gain integrated writing and doctrinal analytical experience. They will do so by exploring the doctrinal issues attorneys may encounter in practice when representing, negotiating with, or litigating against local governments while also considering policy issues of democracy, exclusion, community, race and class raised by the distribution of services, housing, education and other resources in metropolitan areas. Students will more fully recognize local government law as an area of law that touches all of our lives personally and perhaps represents an overlooked potential area of law practice (representing state or local governments or quasi-local governmental entities).
Document P: Required Format for Course Definition Document

1. Date Prepared: February 9, 2007
2. Prepared by: Professor Audrey McFarlane
3. Department: School of Law
4. Course Number(s), including HEGIS code(s): n/a
5. Course Title: Local Government Law Workshop
6. Credit Hours: 3
7. Catalog Description (Paragraph should reflect general aims and nature of the course): This course uses problems, weekly comments and document drafting exercises to examine cutting edge issues in the practice of local government law. Among the specific doctrinal areas covered will be the sources and limits of local government power, incorporation and annexation of localities, home-rule, state pre-emption of local ordinances, intergovernmental cooperation and conflict, and liability of local governments for misuse of power. The course will explore the doctrinal issues attorneys may encounter in practice when representing, negotiating with or litigating against local governments. The course will also explore policy issues of democracy, exclusion, community, race and class raised by the distribution of services, housing, education and other resources in metropolitan areas.
8. Prerequisites: Constitutional Law
9. Faculty qualified to teach course: Professor Audrey McFarlane
10. Course Type (check appropriate)
    Workshop: x
11. Suggested approximate class size: 20
13. Learning Goals:
    The goal of the course is to have students to more fully appreciate the practice of local government law by engaging in exercises that require them to absorb both the legal doctrine while grappling with policy issues that stem mainly from a conflict within local government legal doctrine between favoring decentralization of governmental power while deeply distrusting decentralized power.
14. Assessment Strategies: Draft Documents/Complex Instruments: Short Assignments

15. Suggested Text(s) and Materials (example: textbooks, equipment, software, etc.):
LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW WORKSHOP  Room:
FALL 2007  Wed. 3:00pm - 5:45pm
Professor Audrey G. McFarlane  Admin. Asst.: Gloria Joy, x 4631
Office: Room 305
Phone: (410) 837-6678; e-mail: amcfarlane@ubmail.ubalt.edu

COURSE WEB SITE:  http://law school.westlaw.com for Course syllabus, Assignment Changes, posting Weekly Comments and Web Handouts.

SYLLABUS


Course Requirements:  Your final grade will be based on a ten page paper, completion of 5 writing assignments.
1. Attendance. 2. Class Discussion. If you attend class and participate in discussions by volunteering or answering questions you will receive up to 10 points to be added to your final grade. Grades may be lowered for habitual absence or unpreparedness.
3. Law & Policy Comment Briefs. Approximately once a week you must hand in a 1-2 page written law and policy comment consisting either of an answer to an assigned problem or a critique or analysis of the readings or topic to be covered for that week. The comment paper should include A) an answer to an assigned problem; B) a substantive comments questions or critiques of the legal analysis, political background, social considerations, cultural assumptions or theoretical concerns. C) The comment can also include discussions of relevant current events or personal experiences. D) At a minimum, the comment should take up at least one full page and at a maximum be no longer than 2 pages. E) Each comment will be graded based on the quality of your analysis and support for your arguments or conclusions based on a satisfactory or unsatisfactory basis and each one will receive up to 4 points for up to a total of 40 points of your final grade.
4. Law and Policy Topical Report. You must prepare a 10 page written report and analysis of a current example of local government in action or a local government controversy. The report must include a learned discussion of the controversy, some supporting research to shed further light on the topic and discuss how the topic relates to themes raised in class. Time permitting, you will be required to present your report to the class. The report will be graded based on the quality of your research efforts and write-up and will be worth up to 50 points of your final grade.

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Introduction to the Problems of Decentralization

      i. Italo Calvino, Invisible Cities
      ii. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America
      iii. The Federalist
      iv. Romer v. Evans
      v. Questions:
         (1) What are the key benefits of decentralizing power to local government according to Tocqueville. What flaws in his vision does he acknowledge? What flaws in his vision does he overlook?
         (2) Madison – What are Madison's key reasons for favoring centralization of power? What flaws in his vision does he acknowledge? What flaws in his vision does he overlook?
         (3) Romer – Does the majority opinion mirror Tocqueville or Madison's
views? Does the dissent mirror Toqueville or Madison's views. How does the Romer opinion highlight the benefits or flaws of each of the visions.

PROBLEM #1 (Web Handout)

b. The City as a Public or Private Entity -- pp. 22-56
   i. Frug, City Making: Building Communities Without Building Walls
      (1) Questions: What is the significance of the public or private distinction? Why does it matter whether we designate an entity as one or the other?
      (2) What analysis should we use to determine whether an entity is public or private? Ownership? Function? Level of public access? Something else? Note how you would answers these questions according to these categories as you read the following cases:
         (a) Oregon v. City of Rajneeshpuram
         (b) Marsh v. Alabama
         (c) Intl. Society for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee
         (d) NJ Coalition Against War in the Middle East v. JMB Realty Cor.
         (e) Council of Orgs. & Others for Educ. about Parochiaid, Inc. v. Engler

c. Forms of Local Power -- pp. 56-92; p.508-509; Web Handout
   i. Robert Ellickson, Cities and Homeowners Assns.
   ii. Evan McKenzie, Privatopia
   iii. Gary J. Miller, Cities by Contract
   iv. Joel Garreau, Edge City, p.508
   v. Kramer v. Union Free School District (Web Handout)
   vi. Municipal Bldg. Authority v. Lowder
   vii. Ball v. James

d. The City and Democratic Theory: Perspectives on Decentralization - Economic, Political and Cross-Cultural -- pp. 92-112
   i. Italo Calvinio, Invisible Cities
   ii. Charles Tiebout, A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures
   iii. Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia
   iv. James M. Buchanan, Principles of Urban Fiscal Strategy
   v. Frank I. Michelman, Political Markets and Community Self-Determination: Competing Judicial Models of Local Govt. Legitimacy
   vi. Iris Young, Justice and the Politics of Difference

PROBLEM #2 (Web Handout)

2. The Relationship Between Cities and States -- pp. 113-114

   a. The City-State Relationship as a Matter of Federal Constitutional Law -- pp. 114-
138; Web Handout
i. Hunter v. City of Pittsburgh
iii. Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson
iv. Equality Foundation of Greater Cincinnati, Inc. v. City of Cincinnati
v. David J. Barron, The Promise of Cooley's City: Traces of Local Constitutionalism
vi. Rogers v. Brockette, 588 F.2d 1057 (5th Cir. 1979) (Web Handout)

b. Dillon's Rule -- pp. 138-159
i. John Dillon, Municipal Corporations
ii. Gerald Frug, City Making: Building Communities Without Building Walls
iii. Olesen v. Town (City) of Hurley
iv. Arlington County v. White
vi. State v. Hutchinson

PROBLEM #3 (Web Handout)
c. Special Legislation -- pp. 159-168; Web Handout
i. Chicago Natl. League Ball Club, Inc. v. Thompson
ii. Morial v. Smith & Wesson Corporation
iii. Republic Investment v. Town of Surprise (Web Handout)

PROBLEM #4 (Web Handout)
d. Home Rule Initiative -- pp. 168-187; Web Handout
i. David J. Barron, Reclaiming Home Rule
ii. City of Ocala v. Nye
iii. McCrory Corp. v. Fowler
iv. Kalodimos v. Village of Morton Grove (Web Handout)
v. Gary Schwartz, The Logic of Home Rule and the Private Law Exception
vi. Marshal House, Inc. v. Rent Review and Grievance Board of Brookline

f. State Legislative Preemption -- pp. 226-238 ; Web Handout

3
i. Town of Telluride v. Lot Thirty-Four Venture (reprise)
ii. ILC Data Device Corp. v. County of Sussex (Web Handout)
iii. Cincinnati Bell Telephone Co. v. City of Cincinnati
iv. American Financial Services v. City of Oakland,

PROBLEM #5 (Web Handout)

3. **The Relationship Between Cities and the Federal Government** – pp. 238-278; Handout
   a. Natl. League of Cities v. Usery
   b. Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority
   c. Printz v. United States
   d. David Barron, A Localist Critique of the New Federalism.
   e. Lawrence County v. Lead-Deadwood School District
   f. Nixon v. Missouri Municipal League
   g. Note on the Federal City Relationship

4. **The Relationship Among Neighboring Cities**

PROBLEM #6 (Web Handout)

a. An Introduction to the Relationship Between Cities and Suburbs – pp. 304-333
   i. Peter Hall, Cities of Tomorrow
   ii. Kenneth T. Jackson, Suburbs Into Neighborhoods
   iii. Lewis Mumford, The City in History
   iv. Kenneth Jackson, The Federal Housing Administration
   vi. Robert Fishman, Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia
   vii. Rosalyn Baxandall and Elizabeth Ewen, Picture Windows (How the Suburbs Happened)
   viii. Sheff v. O'Neill

b. City Formation – pp. 333-349
   i. Richard Briffault, Our Localism: Part I – The Structure of Local Government Law
   ii. Gary J. Miller, The Political Origins of the Lakewood Plan
   iii. Robert E. Lang et. al, Reluctant Cities? Exploring Big Unincorporated Census Designated Places
   iv. Board of Supervisors of Sacramento County v. Local Agency Formation Commission
   v. City of Tucson v. Pima County

c. The Distinction Between Residents and Non-Residents -- pp. 349-366
   i. Holt Civic Club v. City of Tuscaloosa
ii. May v. Town of Mountain Village
iii. Wit v. Bernan

d. The Ability of Cities to Favor Their Residents Over Outsiders -- pp. 366-388
i. Martinez v. Bynum
ii. Fort Gratiot Sanitary Landfill, Inc. v. Michigan Dept. of Natural resources
iii. White v. Massachusetts Council of Construction Employers, inc.
iv. United Building & Construction Trades Council of Camden County v. Camden
v. Leydon v. Town of Greenwich

e. The Ability of Cities to Annex Outsiders – pp. 388-407
i. Hunter v. Pittsburgh
ii. Town of Lockport v. Citizens for Community Action
iii. David Rusk, Lessons from Urban America
iv. Gary J. Miller, Municipal Incorporation Under LAFCO
v. In the Matter of the Enlargement and Extension of the Municipal Boundaries of the City of Jackson, Mississippi, 691 So.2d 978 (Miss. 1997) (Web Handout)
vi. Goodyear Farms v. the City of Avondale

f. Secession: The Ability to Become Outsiders -- pp. 407-418
ii. Note on the Staten Island Secession Attempt
iii. Gerald Frug, Is Secesseion From the City of Los Angeles a Good Idea?

5. Conflicts Among Cities – p.418-419

PROBLEM #7 (Web Handout)

a. Exclusionary Zoning -- pp. 419-453
i. Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp.
ii. Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Township of Mt. Laurel, District Court Findings of Fact (Web Handout)
iii. Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Township of Mt. Laurel (Mt. Laurel I)
iv. Note on the Developments after Mt. Laurel I
v. Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County v. Degoff Enterprises, Inc.
vi. Sheryll Cashin, Middle-Class Black Suburbs and the State of Integration
viii. Note on Milliken v. Bradley

b. The Distribution and Redistriuction of Local Wealth -- pp. 453-494; Web Link
i. San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez
iii. Edgewood Independent School District v. Kirby
iv. Claremont School District v. Governor
v. Sheff v. O'Neill
http://www.asbj.com/schoolspending/resources0502guthrie.html
vii. Richard Schragger, Consuming Government

PROBLEM #8 (Web Handout)
c. Sprawl and Efforts to Control It -- pp. 494-527
i. John M. Findley, Magic Lands: Western Cityscapes and American Culture After 1940
ii. Langdon Winner, Silicon Valley Mystery House
iii. Edward Soja, Postmodern Geographies: The reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory
iv. Joel Garreau, Edge City: Life on the New Frontier
vii. Carl Abbott, The Portland Region: Where City and Suburbs Talk to Each Other – And Often Agree
viii. Note on Oregon’s Measure 7
ix. Gregg Easterbrook, Comment on Karen A. Danielsën, Robert E. Lang, and William Fulton’s “Retracting Suburbia: Smart Growth and the Future of Housing”
x. Home Builders and Contractors Assoc. of Brevard v. Dept. of Community Affairs, 585 So.2d 965 (1991) (Web Handout)
6. Regional Solutions to Interlocal Conflict

a. Joint Undertakings – pp. 528-538; Web Handout
i. Interlocal Agreements
v. Gerald Frug, Empowering Cities in a Federal System

b. Public Authorities and Special Districts – 538-550; Web Handout
i. Richard Briffault, Our Localism: Part II-Localism and Legal Theory
ii. People ex rel. younger v. County of El dorado
iii. Note on the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority
iv. Carmel Realty Associates v. Baltimore Development Corp. (Web Handout)

c. Regional Planning, Regional Government and Beyond? -- pp. 550-585; Web Handout
ii. Education/Instructiion v. Moore
iv. David Rusk, Cities Without Suburbs
v. Margaret Weir, Coalition Building For Regionalism
vi. Gerald Frug, City Making: Building Communities Without Building Walls

PROBLEM #9 (Web Handout)

a. City Control of Community Character – pp. 615-650
i. Village of Belle Terre v. Boraas
ii. City of Cleburne, Texas v. Cleburne Living Center
iii. City of Renton v. Playtime Theaters, Inc.
iv. Michael Warner, The Trouble With Normal
v. Richard T. Ford, Bourgeois Communities

b. Community Self-Defense Against Changes in Character -- pp. 650-689
i. Italo Calvino, Invisible Cities
ii. Keith Aoki, Race, Space, and Place: The Relation Between Architectural Modernism, Post-Modernism, Urban Planning, and Gentrification
iii. Robert Caro, The Power Broker
v. Audrey G. McFarlane, When Inclusion Leads to Exclusion
vi. Evan McKenzie, Private Gated Communities in the American Urban Fabric
vii. Maready v. City of Winsont-Salem

8. Paying the City's Expenses – pp. 690-692
PROBLEM #10 (Web Handout)
a. The Impact of Equality Requirements on Revenue Raising -- pp. 692-716
   i. Nordlinger v. Hahn
   iii. California Legislative Analyst's Office, Reconsidering AB 8: Exploring Alternative Ways to Allocate Property Taxes
   iv. Laurie Reynolds, Taxes, Fees, Assessments, Dues and the Get What You Pay For Model of Government
v. 2nd Roc-Jersey Associates v. Town of Morristown
vi. Volusia County v. Aberdeen at Ormond Beach, L.P.
vii. Eric Montarti, A Brief Lesson in TIF
b. Land Use and “Linkage" – pp. 716-732
   i. Fred Bosselman & Nancy Stroud, Mandatory Tithes: The Legality of Land Development Linkage
   ii. Dolan v. City of Tigard
   iii. Home Builders Association of Northern California v. City of Napa
c. City Property Ownership – 732-761
   i. Durand v. IDC Bellingham
   ii. Gerald Frug, Property and Power: Hartog on the Legal History of NYC
   iii. David Osborne & Ted Gaebler, Enterprising Government: Earning Rather than Spending
   iv. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. v. The Village of Arlington Heights
   v. Toledo Edison Co. v. City of Bryan
   vi. Warner Cable Communications, Inc. v. City of Niceville
   vii. Bagford v. Ephraim City
d. Urban Development: The City As A Theme Park – p.803-813
   i. M. Christine Boyer, Cities For Sale: Merchandising History at South Street Seaport
   ii. Peter Eisinger, The Politics of Bread and Circuses
   iii. Michael Sorkin, See You in Disneyland