


Spring 2011

From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: sustainability and resilience in the new urban world

Jack F. Ahern

University of Massachusetts - Amherst, jfa@larp.umass.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/larp_grad_research

 Part of the [Agricultural and Resource Economics Commons](#), [Cultural Resource Management and Policy Analysis Commons](#), [Earth Sciences Commons](#), [Environmental Design Commons](#), [Landscape Architecture Commons](#), [Urban, Community and Regional Planning Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Ahern, Jack F., "From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: sustainability and resilience in the new urban world" (2011). *Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning Studio and Student Research and Creative Activity*. 8.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/larp_grad_research/8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning Studio and Student Research and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Landscape and Urban Planning
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: LAND-D-11-00011R1

Title: From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: sustainability and resilience in the new urban world

Article Type: 100th Volume SI

Keywords: non-equilibrium; sustainability; resilience; adaptive planning and design

Corresponding Author: Dr. Jack Ahern,

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Massachusetts-Amherst

First Author: Jack Ahern

Order of Authors: Jack Ahern

Abstract: The extent to which the 21st Century world will be "sustainable" depends in large part on the sustainability of cities. Early ideas on implementing sustainability focused on concepts of achieving stability, practicing effective management and the control of change and growth-- a "fail-safe" mentality. More recent thinking about change, disturbance, uncertainty, and adaptability is fundamental to the emerging science of resilience, the capacity of systems to reorganize and recover from change and disturbance without changing to other states-- in other words, systems that are "safe to fail." While the concept of resilience is intellectually intriguing, it remains largely unpracticed in contemporary urban planning and design. This essay discusses the theory of resilience as it applies to urban conditions, and offers a suite of strategies intended to build urban resilience capacity: multi-functionality, redundancy and modularization, (bio and social) diversity, multi-scale networks and connectivity, and adaptive planning and design. The strategies are discussed in the context of resilience theory and sustainability science, and are illustrated with innovative policies, projects, and programs selected from international examples.

Detailed Response to Reviewers

Paul,

thanks for your patience.

The reviewer's comments were particularly helpful and challenging. Please pass on my gratitude.

I've attempted to respond to the comments without overly-expanding the length of the essay.

best,

Jack

Jack Ahern, Ph.D., FASLA
Vice Provost for International Programs
Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

From *fail-safe* to *safe-to-fail*: sustainability and resilience in the new urban world

Jack AHERN

Dept. of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning

University of Massachusetts Amherst

jfa@larp.umass.edu

1 **1. The new urban world**

2 Sometime in the year 2007, demographers estimated that global population became
3 predominately urban for the first time in history. Estimates from multiple sources including the
4 United Nations predict this trend to continue throughout this century, with the world’s population
5 reaching 70% urban by 2050. These global data mask significant differences in urban population
6 trends between the developed and the developing world – where much of the increase in urban
7 inhabitants will occur. Despite these regional differences, the world is undeniably becoming
8 more urban – with profound impacts on land use, human welfare, social equity and
9 sustainability, broadly defined. Therefore, the challenge for sustainability in the 21st Century
10 will, arguably, be won or lost in cities and their larger urban regions.

11

12 **2. Sustainability, equilibrium and resilience**

13

14 “Expect the best, plan for the worst, and prepare to be surprised” --*Denis Waitley*

15

16 The modern era of the 20th century was arguably associated with an equilibrium, or
17 deterministic conception of nature, science and ecology. Developed societies embraced a “fail-
18 safe” mentality based on the promise of science and technology to meet social and economic
19 needs, cure disease, and undo the environmental mistakes of previous generations.

20 In the latter half of the 20th century, more-or-less coincident with the advent of
21 sustainability, an alternative, non-equilibrium paradigm of science, of systems, and of the
22 understanding of the natural and built environment emerged (Botkin, 1990). This view, known as

23 chaos or non-equilibrium theory, argued that natural and cultural systems are inherently variable,
24 uncertain, and prone to unexpected change.

25 The fields of ecology and resource management were early adopters and practitioners of
26 the non-equilibrium view. Landscape ecology evolved as an interdisciplinary field that defines
27 landscapes as heterogeneous spatial entities, with inherent disturbance regimes in terms of type,
28 frequency, and intensity of disturbance(s). With its focus on landscape pattern-process
29 relationships, landscape ecology explicitly and systematically brought the non-equilibrium view
30 to landscape planning, particularly in terms of landscape form, pattern, and change (Turner,
31 1990). Concurrently, resource management adopted the concept of adaptive management
32 through which managers could address uncertainty and “learn-by-doing” through the conception
33 and design of management actions as “experimental probes” that could “adapt” if the results
34 were not as expected, or to learn new methods when the actions were proven to be effective.

35 In landscape and urban planning, early thinking about sustainability, however, tended
36 towards a static conception – where sustainability was envisioned as a durable, stable, sometimes
37 formulaic “fail-safe” urban form or condition that – once achieved - could persist for
38 generations, for example through “smart growth” or “new urbanism”. From a non-equilibrium
39 perspective this conflated view of sustainability and stability is paradoxical. How can a static
40 landscape condition be sustainable in a context of unpredictable disturbance and change? A
41 more relevant position “safe-to-fail” anticipates failures and designs systems strategically so that
42 failure is contained and minimized (Steiner 2006). Resilience theory offers a new perspective, or
43 possibly a solution to this paradox of sustainability.

44 Resilience is defined as the capacity of system to respond to change or disturbance
45 without changing its basic state (Walker and Salt, 2006). Building resilience capacity through

46 landscape and urban planning requires that planners and designers identify the stochastic
47 processes and disturbances that a particular landscape or city is likely to face, the frequency and
48 intensity of these events, and how cities can build the adaptive capacity to respond to these
49 disturbances while remaining in a functional state of resilience (Vale et al., 2005). Resilience
50 capacity also requires building an adaptable social infrastructure to assure meaningful
51 participation and achieve equity in the face of socio-economic change and disturbance, and
52 meaningful participation by stakeholders in planning and policy decisions. Resilience demands a
53 new way of thinking about sustainability. Resilience is a more strategic than normative concept,
54 because, to be effective, resilience must be explicitly based on, and informed by, the
55 environmental, ecological, social, and economic drivers and dynamics of a particular place, and
56 it must be integrated across a range of linked scales (Pickett et al., 2004). In addition, by
57 definition, resilience depends on being able to adapt to unprecedented and unexpected changes.

58 Resilience capacity can be strengthened by biodiversity, modularity, tight feedbacks,
59 social capital, acknowledging slow variables and thresholds, and innovation (Walker and Salt,
60 2007). Resilience capacity is well-suited to an adaptive approach to planning and design, in
61 which innovation is pursued through responsible experimentation, developing a culture of
62 monitoring, and learning from modest failures.

63 Sustainability science (SS) is an emerging interdisciplinary field that shares principles,
64 goals, knowledge and operating methods with sustainability and resilience theory. SS also shares
65 many fundamentals of landscape ecology including the many approaches to study nature-society
66 interactions in heterogeneous and dynamic landscapes at multiple scales (Wu, 2006). SS is
67 problem-solving focused. It addresses the dynamic interactions between nature and society,
68 considering both how social change influences the environment and how environmental change

69 shapes society. SS aims to provide knowledge “co-produced” by scholars and practitioners to
70 inform decision making for sustainable development (Clark and Dickson, 2003). SS also
71 addresses the behavior of complex self-organizing systems (e.g. cities) supporting social “actors”
72 to engage sustainability and resilience challenges in the face of uncertainty and limited
73 information (Kates et al., 2001).

74

75 **3. Strategies for building urban resilience capacity**

76 A proposed suite of five urban planning and design strategies for building urban
77 resilience includes: multifunctionality, redundancy and modularization, (bio and social)
78 diversity, multi-scale networks and connectivity, and adaptive planning and design. These
79 strategies are discussed below and further explained in (Ahern, 2010).

80

81 **3.1. Multifunctionality**

82 In the new urban world, planners and designers will be challenged to find new ways to
83 provide for sustainable ecosystem services in the increasingly limited spaces within compact
84 cities. Multifunctionality can be achieved through intertwining/combining functions, stacking or
85 time-shifting. It is inherently efficient spatially and economically, and benefits by support from
86 the social constituents and stakeholders associated with the multiple functions provided.
87 Multifunctionality supports response diversity in the functions provided. Examples include the
88 Green Streets program in Portland, Oregon, urban stormwater wetlands as at Potsdammer Platz
89 in Berlin, Germany, wildlife highway crossings as in Banff National Park, Alberta,, and
90 floodplain parks as in Buffalo Bayou, Houston Texas.

91

92 **3.2. Redundancy and modularization**

93 Redundancy and modularization are achieved when multiple elements or components
94 provide the same, similar, or backup functions. Redundancy and modularization spread risks -
95 across time, across geographical areas, and across multiple systems. When a major urban
96 function or service is provided by a centralized entity or infrastructure, it is more vulnerable to
97 failure. When the same function is provided by a distributed or decentralized system, it is more
98 resilient to disturbance. Redundancy and modularization are strategies to avoid putting “all your
99 eggs in one basket,” and for preparing and pre-planning for when (not if) a system fails.
100 Examples include site or sub-watershed based sewerage or stormwater systems as in the
101 Chicago, Illinois Green Alleys program, or the Augustenborg Housing Project retrofit in Malmö,
102 Sweden.

103

104 **3.3. (Bio and social) diversity**

105 Biodiversity along with social, physical, and economic diversity, are important and
106 effective strategies to support urban resilience. Biodiversity has been described metaphorically as
107 a “library of knowledge,” some of which is familiar and valued, while some remains “unread, but
108 on the library shelves” waiting for its value or function to be discovered (Lister, 2007). Response
109 diversity in biological systems refers to the diversity of species within functional groups that
110 have different responses to disturbance and stress (e.g., temperature, pollution, disease). Thus
111 with a greater number of species performing a similar function, the ecosystem services provided
112 by any functional group—for example, the decomposers - are more likely to be sustained over a
113 wider range of conditions, and the system will have a greater capacity to recover from
114 disturbance. An example of response diversity applied to urban bio-physical systems includes

115 low impact development practices such as permeable pavement and bioswales, and urban tree
116 canopy managed to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground. Each feature adds to the
117 response diversity of the urban stormwater system, reducing the amount of storm drainage
118 infrastructure that a city needs to build and maintain, and enhancing the overall resilience
119 capacity of that system. Likewise, cities with higher levels of economic and social diversity
120 have a more complex response diversity by which they are better positioned to adapt to change
121 and socio-economic disturbance. For example, an economically and socially diverse city can
122 support social services and cultural programs that keep it economically vibrant, equitable, and
123 attractive place for people to live and work , despite economic and social disturbances. In
124 contrast, less socially-diverse communities often struggle to recover from disturbances and show
125 characteristics of non-resilience, by “flipping” to other conditions.

126 .

127

128 **3.4. Multi-scale networks and connectivity**

129 Networks are systems that support functions by way of connectivity. When an urban
130 landscape is understood as a system that performs functions, connectivity is often the critical
131 parameter - and the lack of connectivity is often a prime cause of malfunction or failure of
132 particular functions. Multi-scale connectivity is important when planning for functions that
133 operate at multiple scales: for example walking trails that link with bus routes, or urban drainage
134 swales that connect to non-channelized low-order streams, that, in turn, link with higher-order
135 streams. In urban environments, connectivity of built systems is generally robust but in natural
136 systems is typically greatly reduced, often resulting in fragmentation—the separation and
137 isolation of urban landscape elements with significant impacts on specific ecological processes

138 that require connectivity (e.g., species dispersal and movement). Complex networks build
139 resilience capacity through redundant circuitry that maintains functional connectivity after
140 network disturbance(s). Connectivity is arguably a primary generator of sustainable urban form -
141 built around blue-green networks that support biodiversity, hydrological processes, pedestrian
142 transportation, climatic modification, neighborhood identity and aesthetic enhancements.
143 Examples of multi-scale networks include many greenways and ecological networks, and the
144 Staten Island Bluebelt that supports urban drainage, wildlife habitat and recreational functions in
145 New York City.

146

147 **3.5. Adaptive planning and design**

148 Adaptive planning and design conceives the “problem” of making decisions with
149 imperfect knowledge about change and uncertain disturbances as an “opportunity” to “learn-by-
150 doing” (Holling, 1978). Under an adaptive model, urban plans and designs can be understood as
151 hypotheses of how a policy or project will influence particular landscape processes or functions
152 and implemented planning policies or designs become “experiments” from which experts,
153 professionals, and decision makers may gain new knowledge through monitoring and analysis.
154 While adaptive management has been practiced successfully in natural resource management for
155 decades, its application to urban planning and design is rare. If urban planning and design is truly
156 innovative and adaptive in its pursuit of sustainability and resilience, it has an inherent potential
157 to fail. To reduce the risk of failure, innovations can be “piloted” as “safe-to-fail” design
158 experiments (Lister, 2007). The Sustainable Sites initiative is explicitly recognizing monitoring
159 activities in support of an adaptive approach in sustainable site design. Examples of adaptive

160 planning and design include the unprecedented restoration and remediation at the Emscher
161 Landscape Park in Germany, and the SEA Street project in Seattle, Washington.

162

163 **4. Discussion and research needs**

164 Resilience is a complex, multi-dimensional challenge for urban sustainability planning
165 and design. The strategies proposed above will require a new culture of innovation, monitoring
166 and assessment of plans and built works – from which plan and project-specific data can be
167 obtained to “test” the hypotheses that innovative plans and designs inherently represent.

168 Assessment of ecosystem services is gaining acceptance as a universal and explicit approach to
169 the measurement of sustainability, and has proven useful to spatially associate urban form with
170 multiple social, and biophysical functions. Recent sustainability initiatives including LEED and
171 Sustainable Sites offer protocols for more rigorous assessment of built works, in specific terms,
172 but could be expanded to monitor performance and impacts over time.

173 Achieving a resilient sustainability will depend on significant innovations. In the 21st
174 century, much of the infrastructure of the developed world will be replaced or rebuilt, and even
175 more infrastructure will be needed to service the rapidly expanding cities of the developing
176 world. Ironically, when viewed as an opportunity, the magnitude of global infrastructure
177 (re)development represents an unprecedented opportunity to redirect and (re)conceive the
178 process of urbanization from one that is inherently destructive to one that is sustainable and
179 resilient in specific terms. This is the promise and challenge of green infrastructure as a key idea
180 to build resilience capacity.

181 Finally, these challenges will demand a higher level of inter- or transdisciplinary
182 collaboration in both research and practice than presently exists. Both the established U.S.

183 National Science Foundation's Urban Long Term Ecological Research Program (LTER) and the
184 newer U.S. National Science Foundation - U.S. Forest Service' Urban Long Term Research Area
185 program (ULTRA) are models for the type of long term, interdisciplinary research on complex
186 urban systems needed to build resilience capacity that is a prerequisite of sustainability.

187 Addressing the challenges of sustainability and resilience arguably will require a
188 transdisciplinary, integrative sustainability science that differs from science as we know it in
189 terms of the structure, methods and content of the questions we ask. In addition to adaptive
190 design focused on physical urban systems, and urban biodiversity, research is needed on how to
191 achieve greater social learning and meaningful social engagement and participation in decision-
192 making and policy setting. Research is needed to learn what makes knowledge about nature-
193 society interactions useful within both science and society to build resilience capacity and to
194 guide society on a sustainable trajectory (Kates et al. 2001). Solutions for sustainability and
195 resilience therefore are more likely to evolve from such inter- and transdisciplinary research and
196 project-based collaborations involving an increasing number of overlapping and complimentary
197 disciplines.

References

1. Ahern, J., 2010. Planning and design for sustainable and resilient cities: theories, strategies, and best practices for green infrastructure, In: Novotny, V., Ahern, J., Brown, P. (Eds.), *Water-Centric Sustainable Communities*. John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, pp. 135-176.
2. Botkin, D., 1990. *Discordant Harmonies: A New Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford University Press, New York.
3. Clark, W.C., Dickson, N.M., 2003. Sustainability science: the emerging research program. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 100, 8059-8061.
4. Holling C.S., 1978. *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management*. International Series on Applied Systems Analysis, Vol. 3. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
5. Kates, R., et al., 2001. Sustainability science. *Science* 292(5517), 641-642.
6. Lister, N-M., 2007. Sustainable large parks: ecological design or designer ecology? In: Hargreaves, G., Czerniak, J. (Eds.), *Large Parks*. Architectural Press, New York, Princeton, NJ, pp. 35–54.
7. Pickett S.T.A., Cadenasso, M.L., Grove, J.M., 2004. Resilient cities: meaning, models, and metaphor for integrating the ecological, socio-economic, and planning realms. *Landscape Urban Plan.* 69, 369–384.
8. Steiner, F.R., 2006. Metropolitan resilience: the role of universities in facilitating a sustainable metropolitan future. In: Nelson, A.C., Allen, B.L., Trauger, D.L. (Eds.), *Toward a Resilient Metropolis*. Metropolitan Institute Press, Alexandria, VA, pp. 1-18.
9. Turner, M.G., 1990. Landscape ecology: the effect of pattern on process. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Systematics* 20, 171–197.
10. Vale, L., Campanella, J., Thomas, J., 2005. *The Resilient City: How Modern Cities Recover from Disaster*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
11. Walker, B., Salt, D., 2006. *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
12. Wu, J., 2006. Landscape ecology, cross-disciplinarity, and sustainability science. *Landscape Ecol.* 21, 1-4.

Jack Ahern

Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning, University of Massachusetts – Amherst, MA

Jack Ahern is a landscape architect who focuses his research on the application of landscape ecological theories, principles and methods on landscape planning and design projects. Earlier, he worked on broad-scale integrated systems of protected lands known as greenways – linking their spatial configuration and resource base with ecosystem services and human use(s). This work led him to the Netherlands for cross-cultural research on landscape planning and ecology, leading to his Ph.D. from Wageningen University (2002). His books address multiple aspects of his applied research including: *Water-Centric Sustainable Communities* (2010) (Co-author), *Measuring Landscapes: A Planner's Handbook* (2006) (Co-author), *Biodiversity Planning and Design: Sustainable Practices* (2006) (Lead co-author), *Greenways as Strategic Landscape Planning: Theory and Application* (2002); *A Guide to the Landscape Architecture of Boston* (1999); *Greenways: the Beginning of an International Movement* (1995) (Co-author).

Ahern's current research has shifted to applied ecologically-based planning and design of urban environments for sustainability and resilience. This work continues to engage landscape ecology as a theoretical platform to integrate the emerging, fine-scaled professional practices of green infrastructure and landscape urbanism across scales to form green urban networks linked with ecosystem services, sustainability and to build resilience capacity.