

Section 5.5

- 1) Do you agree with the premise on page 299 that we should use marketing classifications in order to define urban landscape? Or are these just arbitrary variables that will ultimately confound the results?
“PRIZM categorizes people into lifestyle cluster based on household education, income, occupation, race/ancestry, family composition, and housing”
- 2) On page 302, the last paragraph of 5.5.2, they mention an example with Hurricane Katrina and how they are comparing the “resiliency of social and ecological structures in response to trauma”. How do you feel about this example? Is it a good way to compare before and after?
- 3) In section 5.5.3 several models for social-ecological models are described, which one do you think would work best in the US? Do you think you would use a different model for other countries? Which would you use for a European city? What about for a “developing” city?
- 4) Do you think anything important is missing from Figure 5.5.2, or do you think it is pretty inclusive?

Section 5.6

- 5) Do you agree that there needs to be some incentive, like a tax break or a fee for greenhouse gases, in order to improve our communities?
- 6) On page 312 they mention how Philadelphia is an example of a city where parks provide ecosystem services that ultimately save/make money for the city. Do you think this is feasible in most cities? Why or why not?
- 7) If you had to pitch the idea of creating or maintaining a greenspace in an urban area to someone, what would you stress is the best benefit?
- 8) How do you feel about the use of wildlife corridors or green bridges in cities? Is it a good idea? What types of organisms will make use of them?