

Planning Education: Striking a Better Balance

Randall Arendt

Note: *The Planetizen article wording is in black, and the blue paragraphs are those which were cut from the original draft to down-size it by half for magazine publication.*

A list of more than 100 co-signatories appears at the end of this article.

An Incomplete Education

Although the importance of physical planning has gained recognition over the last 20 years, planning education has lagged, becoming less relevant to the needs of graduates who are required to take many courses peripheral to jobs offered by state and local agencies, and by consulting firms.

Unfortunately, few planners' training includes detailed study of traditional towns and cities, or new and emerging urban forms meeting 21st century challenges. Planning students are generally not required to analyze how the scale and arrangement of a community's component parts (such as neighborhoods, streets and boulevards, parks and open spaces) contribute to its functioning as a livable, walkable, bikeable, sustainable place.

Many planning schools have focused instead on demographic trend analysis, sociology, engineering basics, planning theory, land-use law, public policy formulation, citizen participation, quantitative methods, transportation planning, social and health planning, local planning administration, gender studies, and GIS. All of these are important (particularly engineering basics as they pertain to slopes and hydrology), but it is curious that one of the profession's central subjects (i.e., the physical layout of towns and cities) is studied so little.

As Prof. Tom Campanella of UNC has observed, "Once the traditional focus of physical planning was lost, the profession was effectively without a keel. It became fragmented, creating a chronic identity crisis — a nagging uncertainty about purpose and relevance...By forgoing its traditional focus and expanding too quickly, planning became a jack-of-all-trades, master of none." In the view of Prof. Eugenie Birch of the University of Pennsylvania, "Planning schools place too much emphasis on subfields such that students do not identify with being planners or with the sole distinguishing feature of the profession -- the town planning or physical planning knowledge that should unite the field"

As a result, planning education at most universities significantly underserves the needs of their graduates. In the words of Karen Hundt, who directs the Community Design Group at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency, "Because too many planners focus on zoning and land use, rather than on three-dimensional aspects, they often cannot visualize what the codes and policies they write will produce."

Jonathan Edwards, planning director in Hanover NH, believes that “one large reason why planners focus so much on the legalistic, procedural, and socio-economic perspectives is because universities shifted away from physical planning to social policy planning based on sociological and economic theories or ideologies, emphasizing process, not product”. (email 9.21.12) As a result, he says, “Planning has become increasingly unable to relate to the main expectations of citizens -- which are based on visual and place-centered attributes (do I like how my town looks, do I enjoy the visual quality my neighborhood? Is it a pleasant place to be in?) -- or to produce functional environments (can I easily get around, are things convenient?). These expectations cannot be effectively achieved without skill in physical planning. How many ugly, disjointed, soul-crushing commercial strips and subdivisions have gone through extensive review processes, governed by policy-driven criteria, and yet produce places where people feel uncomfortable and frustrated, and which they choose to avoid unless they have no choice? It is as if an artisan were trained in the function of each tool, but had no idea of how to use the tools to create an aesthetic and functional work of craftsmanship.”

As noted by Jason Beske, past chair of APA’s Urban Design and Preservation Division, “Local government planners are often unequipped or under-equipped to deal with development in a real-world scenario. It takes a profound understanding of physical development to work out pragmatic and desired outcomes with developers that incorporate the time-tested principles of community design. Some of the most effective planners have a multi-disciplinary background that includes training in landscape architecture or architecture.” (email from Jason Beske, 6.21.2112)

He adds:” Although the social sciences should remain as a complementary element in planning education, an emphasis on urban design and form should receive more significant attention in academia... Planning programs could benefit greatly by creating more positions for planners who not only have a physical planning education, but who have also practiced urban design; practitioners that have put solutions on the ground. Planning needs to reclaim the task of physically and spatially arranging communities since it has been relegated to developers and allied professions whose specialties rest in areas other than planning and urban design.”

Kris Krider, a consulting planner in Davidson NC, who agrees that planning education does not provide a strong enough design curriculum, has observed “a lack of technical plan reading skills and a particular lack of site experience. Even if the planning students just visited construction sites they would be profoundly more mindful of the impacts, become more familiar with the infrastructure and recognize the complexity of development.” (email 9.20.12)

Roger Eastman of Flagstaff AZ recalls that in his first year of planning school (1975) he studied the history of planning, learning about the great cities and towns in Europe and elsewhere. “And that was that – the idea of building up from those traditional towns was lost, and quickly I was taught how to create hierarchies of streets, cul-de-sac and loopy street subdivisions, and without even knowing it, how to perpetuate sprawl. .. It is astounding that so few planning schools are teaching the real essence of planning and place making, 35 years later”. (email, 9.18.12)

John Fernsler, a planner and urban designer at Wallace, Roberts & Todd , recalls that at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1970s in the 70’s the core urban design curriculum was taught almost entirely by practitioners, but that the city planning faculty were all academicians. (email 9.19.12)

In the words of Jack Ahern, Vice Provost of International Programs and Professor of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional

Planning at UMass/Amherst, “Design-literate planners are needed to meet the urbanization challenge of the 21st century, to work in concert with other design professionals, stakeholders, and decision-makers. (email 6.27.12). In a similar vein, Margaret Rifkin, urban designer and planning coordinator at the Montgomery County (MD) Planning Department adds that “Breaking down silos between designers and planners will also result in better collaboration in the work world.”

Doug Kelbaugh, Professor of Architecture and Urban Design at the University of Michigan, adds that “cities and towns need more generalists to complement specialists on their staffs. If MUP graduates had more urban design and physical planning skills, it would improve our communities, as well as their career prospects.”

The committees determining academic accreditation standards should take notice and greatly expand the number of their members who understand and appreciate the spatial and physical (as well as the economic, ecological, and social) aspects of community design. Otherwise, it is unlikely that curriculum imbalances will be redressed, as the ever-growing list of required nondesign courses crowds out opportunities for design training. As Prof. Emily Talen of Arizona State University notes, “I’ve never agreed that education for planners should elevate economic theory and methods above urban design. Why should input-output analysis be more important to an urban planner than knowing the elements of a walkable street?” The problem is so critical that some planning firms prefer hiring landscape architecture graduates instead of planners, as they possess solid design backgrounds and can learn most technical aspects of planning on the job.

III-Prepared Practitioners

Rick Bernhardt, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County Planning Department, notes that “the largest deficiency in planners I’ve hired over the last 40 years is their complete lack of understanding of urban design basics. Successful implementation of planning programs for building more sustainable, efficient, and livable communities must be based on a solid urban design foundation. By understanding urban design interrelationships, a planner is better equipped to think broadly, horizontally and creatively across issues in solving the day-to-day problems that arise.”

”

Other practitioners agree: Jonathan Edwards feels that “without a foundation in physical planning, planners are not adept at working out practical solutions to real problems, which is one of the core missions of municipal government, ceding the field primarily to engineers, who have their own limitations.” (email 9.21.12) Beth Humstone, an urban planner who teaches at Boston Architectural College, writes that “we need to inject more urban design and history of urban form courses into the basic planning school curriculum.” (email dated 9.6.12). Recalling her planning education at the Harvard GSD 40 years ago, she remembers that her instruction was short on design except for one course, and that when she signed up for studios with architecture and landscape architecture students, she found them to be dismissive of planners. When her father studied at the same school a generation earlier, drawing classes were required, so that graduates would not enter the profession without this basic skill.

Lucy Rowland, a multiple term planning commissioner in Athens-Clarke County GA, relates that their “current planning director is a landscape architect, the first after a long line of planners.

With his leadership, the staff has become much more responsive to context and architectural standards, particularly in the downtown area. Urban design is MUCH more at the forefront than it was 20 years ago, and the skills sets are very different.” (email 9.20.12) She further notes that “staff spends time educating residents and officials about the importance of scale, design, and form, but may not have had formal education in their professional programs. Lifelong learning is paramount, but it would be better if they practiced through design courses, drawing, etc in school.

Davidson, NC has selected architects and landscape architects to fill its planning positions for decades. According to Dawn Blobaum, such design education trains one “to think broadly, to envision a future and articulate that vision, both verbally and through drawings. This serves you well as you puzzle through the many issues in town planning, as you discuss those issues with citizens, and as you codify those issues in ordinances.” An architectural graduate she hired as a planner (Kris Krider) recalls that the department was therefore able to create its own design unit which was useful in commenting on public works projects, in-house small area planning efforts, and site plan review.

In nearby Huntersville, Planning Director Jack Simoneau agrees: “Some design background is important. We’ve hired landscape architecture graduates, as their sense of design and ability to draw concepts are very helpful to developers and staff. We hired interns from landscape architecture and architecture programs to prepare our illustrated *Design Guidebook*”.

Bill Collins, former planning director for Teton County WY, recalls that he “always filled at least one planning position with a design professional. Because of their lack of design skills, most planners work more as regulators. They learn to interpret codes and regulations but don’t plan. Physical form has profound impacts on the character of places, yet planning the physical form is typically left to developers, with planners becoming bystanders.”

Curriculum Imbalances

The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB), which conducts accreditation for all academic planning programs in North America, contains a wide range of academics, practitioners, and officials, including some designers. Its members are selected by four organizations. APA appoints a public member (often an elected official or issue advocate); AICP appoints three practitioners; and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning appoints one university administrator and three planning educators. Over the years the PAB has been divided on whether design should be a core curriculum requirement or just an elective or specialization, with the result that planning curricula at many universities have drifted away from having robust design and plan-making components to ones dominated by other fields of interest. To be fair, PAB members reflect the policies and priorities of the three organizations that appoint them, and are in essence messengers for those groups which have overseen the continued drift of planning away from its roots, ceding much professional ground to architects, landscape architects, and engineers in the process.

One consequence of not requiring more design and plan-making in curricula is that much faculty hiring has veered away from those core aspects of the profession. Faculty weak or uninterested in design produce more policy-oriented planners who then fill the ranks of the APA/AICP, providing little opportunity for breaking the cycle and infusing the profession with graduates sensitive to design issues and trained in spatial and physical aspects. The goal would not be to

train all planning students to become designers, but to train some that way and to engage others in design issues so they learn physical design fundamentals. Many would agree with Lisa Wise, a Cal Poly lecturer who finds it “frustrating that physical planning is dominated by architects and landscape architects and that planning has become synonymous with permit-processing”.

Thirty-six years ago Mel Levin, a planning professor at Rutgers University, then with 11 years experience working for planning agencies and consulting firms, wrote "Why Can't Johnny Plan?", an article arguing for a spatial and physical planning component in planning education. In it, he asserted that students are not receiving “usable professional training” because faculty “haven’t spent enough time in the real world of planning agencies and consulting firms. They have given their energies to earning Ph.D’s and writing scholarly tomes, not drafting and implementing zoning ordinances... If they can’t teach students how to do the practical work of a planner, it’s because they’ve never been real planners themselves.”

As noted by Prof. Jon Rodiek of Texas A&M, ‘Physical planning has become the unwanted child of many planning programs, where few faculty can teach physical planning /land use planning/ urban development because they have not been trained or experienced in these aspects themselves.’ Lamenting the wide “fissure between the practice of planning and the teaching of planning”, Levin suggested that “faculty be required to have stipulated amounts of field experience as part of the procedure for hiring, promoting, or granting tenure”, adding that “the younger untenured faculty could be granted one- or two-year leaves of absence to work for agencies and consultants.”

Rodiek recommends that university departments break this cycle by proactively recruiting faculty trained and experienced in spatial/physical planning, form-based codes, and conservation design. “The purpose for introducing this physical planning capability is not to derail existing programs but to **strengthen those programs’ teaching skills and the employability of graduates.**” Of course, changes in faculty composition must be approached carefully so that existing faculty will not feel threatened.

Unfortunately, the academic experience of Chris Parker, planning director in Dover NH, is probably fairly typical. He writes that: “in graduate School the focus was on law and administration/process. Only one class focused on site plan review and urban form. If not for internships and pre- and post-graduate work in a community, I would not have learned about the urban form. Added to that, I have been lucky enough to work in a community that has an urban form worth learning from.” He adds that “A planner’s greatest tool is to be able to convey the sense of place that the community is trying to achieve. If he has no idea what a place feels like, or how to understand and gauge that sense, he cannot fully communicate it, or work with a community to develop one. Process is important and understanding systems and how things work is important, but shouldn’t take away from the design elements of planning, and community building.” (email 9.28.12)

In a nutshell, urban design should not be so nearly absent from urban planning curricula. When urban planning is seen – by the PAB and by overwhelmingly nondesign faculties -- largely as a set of social issues to be approached through governmental policy proposals, the need to redress the balance in academic programs is not fully appreciated, and physical planning continues to receive very short shrift.

Carlos Rodrigues who teaches as an adjunct professor at Rutgers University, is “constantly amazed at how reluctant urban design studio students are to pick up a marker and draw, and how little they know about the nuts and bolts of physical planning. For example, one might think a planning student would understand the critical need to master the dimensions of the various building blocks of places, but many can't even remember the size of a parking stall, much less discuss the width of townhouse lots.” (email 9.19.12)

Interestingly, academic planning departments were originally much stronger in design. The first independent department and graduate degree in city planning was created at Harvard by its landscape architecture faculty. Tom Comitta, a consulting planner from West Chester PA, writes that “From 1904 to 1935, students of city planning, landscape architecture, and architecture attended many classes together and learned how to become multi-disciplinary by cross-registering and learning each other’s craft. At MIT, in 1938, according to Vincent Kling, Sr., ‘we all took classes together’ (the students of architecture, planning, and civil engineering).” However, policy makers gradually tended to replace plan-makers after WWII, virtually excluding physical designers. Silo-building had begun.

APA’s Urban Design and Preservation Division (UDPD) encouraged the PAB during the latest round of accreditation standard revisions “to place greater importance on urban design and physical planning in academic planning programs.” The rationale, according to Jason Beske, past UDPD chair, is that “urban design courses provide valuable skills to help planners illustrate and implement planning policies and produce better projects.” APA and AICP weighed in on this issue as well. Although this impassioned plea failed to produce any improvements, it did help avoid detrimental changes that would have further eroded design components.

Perhaps PAB members – and those who appoint them -- need to speak more with planning directors such as Jack Simoneau, who observes that “When planning departments have enough design work to keep an LA or architect on staff that’s great, but an overwhelming majority don’t. Therefore, reintroducing design into planning education is essential. Without it, each planner is on his own to figure things out. Every community would benefit, not just those with design standards. Such training would be invaluable in preparing long range/small area plans, helping to influence or demonstrate alternatives to developers, and helping communities recognize the importance of good design.”

A Path Forward

For starters, all university planning departments should do as some already do, and invite graduates back after 5-10 years to speak candidly about which courses they have found most helpful -- and least helpful. The results, to be shared with the PAB, could help departments better prepare their graduates for jobs outside academia, and could help the PAB when revising accreditation criteria.

1. It’s not uncommon for junior faculty to be denied promotion when he/she has focused more on professional practice and plan creation than on producing peer-reviewed articles for scholarly journals, and to learn that one’s professional practice accomplishments count little in tenure decisions. This doesn’t imply that any plan should be considered. In

the words of Prof. Eugenie Birch, “such work must rise above the ordinary (advancing knowledge), and tenure committees would need to set criteria for judging such”.

Talen suggests a middle ground: “There should be more non-tenured practitioners on faculty – ‘professors of practice’ (not simply adjuncts). Many schools take this approach and we should support that idea, not force these valued practitioners to become academic scholars too.”

According to Prof. Will Green of the Landscape Architecture Department at URI, who was in professional practice for 11 years before joining the university, “many schools struggle with balancing needs for experienced professionals to be teaching in a department with PhD’s. Many PhD’s do not have the experience needed to teach the profession.” (email 9.17.12)

According to Prof. Ellen Dunham-Jones of the Georgia Institute of Technology, a view often heard in planning schools is that “urban design isn't a ‘tenure-able’ area in faculties of planning. The planning faculty do not respect the few peer-reviewed journals that publish urban designs as up to their standards, and do not equate publishing a report of a local community plan developed with all of the community input that so many of us advocate, as equivalent to the publishing of a national journal article.” (email from E. Dunham-Jones, 7.7.12). Another obstacle is that there is very little sponsored research in areas of physical planning and urban design.

Apart from the few schools that emphasize physical planning, some others offer multiple tracks. The City Design and Development part of MIT's curriculum, which attracts 40 percent of the department's students, offers classes in urban design, site planning, land-use planning, real estate development, and the theory of city form, according to Prof. Lawrence Vale.

Times New Roman

At UNC in Chapel Hill, Tom Campanella has called for a “renewed emphasis on physical planning: (which) is essential to refocusing, recalibrating and renewing the profession”. He continues: “Students should be trained to be keen observers of urban landscapes, ... and while they cannot master site engineering, they should be competent site analysts and be fluent in assessing site plans of others. Such training would place competency in shaping the built environment at the very center of the planning education solar system”.

Cal Poly's “learn by doing” approach includes intensive labs, often with real clients. Interning is required, providing valuable, practical, hands-on experience. Notably, the department has added two urban designers to its faculty. Alison Pernell recalls her Cal Poly experience beginning with two years of design lab where planning students joined landscape architecture and architecture students in learning drafting, landscape design, and spatial composition. “By the third year, each class was assigned to prepare a General Plan for a client community, including facilitating a public process. At least half our design projects were for real properties which we visited.” By the fourth year, students had completed internships and had become grounded in these concepts and practices. After graduation Pernell entered the workplace feeling incredibly well prepared. Mike Boswell, who teaches at CalPoly, notes that “some programs report that they teach urban design when in fact they are really teaching CAD or SketchUp. Other programs claim they teach urban design but teach no drafting skills, only theory. To me, neither of these are teaching urban design. Urban design is an integrative discipline that at least includes drafting skills, design theory, and social and environmental science. This is how we do it at Cal Poly. We teach basic

drafting skills in studio, we teach design theory, we teach social and environmental science, and then we have students integrate this information in urban design studios.” (email 8.21.12)

Another exceptional program is offered by Ball State University in Muncie IN, where all first year students in urban planning, architecture, and landscape architecture take a common design course together with studios, lectures, and a required graphics course to build a solid foundation in all three disciplines before splitting into separate academic streams. According to the departmental website, “Studying this way underscores the point that environmental planning and design are interconnected with all other disciplines.” Another benefit of this common course is that it helps students choose their major. Perhaps due to this experience, planning students there value design studios and graphics courses, signing up for them in large numbers, recognizing that this training will help them become better and more employable professionals after graduation.

At the University of Pennsylvania, according to Gary Hack (who has served on site visit teams for the PAB and as its chair), “the first year workshop taken by all planning students involves students in preparing plans and quite detailed proposals for districts of Philadelphia. They then take at least one additional studio involving a real project (often sponsored by a community). Those specializing in planning the built environment take two more studios – one in site planning and a second in planning for the public realm. All the students learn Sketchup and other tools for visualizing the development of places. So they come out quite skilled.” (email from Gary Hack, 6.27.12).

Another solution is the model applied at UMass, in one of the few departments nationwide that combine landscape architecture and regional planning. This model, according to Ahern, “fosters a culture of awareness, respect and intellectual curiosity that builds deeper connections between LA’s and planners. A combined program can offer a dual degree, which does take additional time for students. However, our dual degree enrollment has risen steadily in the last decade – often engaging students who start in a single program but learn of the complementarity of the disciplines as well as their personal intellectual interests and strengths.” (email 6.27.12)

Some leading urbanists who are full-time AICP planners (such as Victor Dover) have entered the planning profession after consciously rejecting conventional planning schools and opting for training in architecture, urban design, or landscape architecture in order to learn how to think like designers.

Nature abhors a vacuum and, unsurprisingly, architects have re-entered the planning realm (where they had been very active before WWII), to educate a generation of planners in designing livable towns and cities, chiefly through the CNU and the Form-Based Codes Institute. Similarly, landscape architects have also stepped in, advocating ecological planning and conservation design. To its credit, the planning establishment has gradually embraced these breaths of fresh air, although it continues to virtually ignore design education when shaping curricula. Sadly, not every planning school offers design courses, and very few require them. The few existing design related courses are usually electives taken by a minority of students, probably because they are considered time-consuming, difficult, and nonessential.

. In this context is it not surprising that planners have, until very recently, operated in a system that allows for all the individual component parts of a town to be built (shops, offices, homes, roads, public facilities, etc.), but which has demonstrated time and again, through regulations making it difficult or impossible to mix uses, that it does not understand how they should be scaled, combined, arranged, and connected to produce anything resembling a normal town of the type this

country produced by the thousands during its first three centuries (largely without planners). It is as if carmakers did a good job of manufacturing engines, steering wheels, brakes, transmissions, and auto bodies, but somehow had not mastered the technique of assembling them into vehicles that run safely and comfortably. As noted by Prof. Lewis Hopkins at the University of Illinois, “knowing how to put things together is crucial -- arguably from physical, social, economic, and ecological perspectives”. (email 6.17.12).

It might be very helpful if APA were to survey planning directors to determine how many municipalities have ordinances containing some design-based standard (e.g., highway overlay zones, TNDs, conservation design, form based codes). Communities with such standards would be asked if any staff has design training and, if not, would the directors see value in having personnel with such training.

The results could inform the debate over striking a better balance in planning curricula. On a hopeful note, the UDPD has been furthering the idea, originally proposed by AICP, of creating an Advanced Specialty Certification in Urban Design for AICP planners. And the Form-Based Codes Institute recently began looking at planning education and the role of design, with a view toward creating a coalition of advocates. The time might therefore be growing ripe for substantial change not merely another deck-chair rearrangement.

An Ideal Curriculum: A Personal Viewpoint

Based on my own professional experience over the last 40 years, the ideal curriculum would be a two-year course leading to a degree that might be called Physical Planning, Community Planning, or Landscape Planning. Rather than ask LA or planning students to add a third year to their course to obtain a dual degree (currently the best approach, offered at a few universities), this course would provide the best of both worlds at a more affordable cost. \

In addition to offering a broad range of electives in non-design subjects, it would offer design training to meet the needs of graduates entering the job market. In the first year that training would focus on environmental planning and conservation design, while in the second year it would shift to new urbanism and form-based code design (related to the green infrastructure), supplemented by a course in planning and architectural history over the last 250 years (long enough to encompass Edinburgh’s New Town plan and building designs, and that of many other distinguished cities such as Savannah). Summer between the two course years would include travel and study in cities with a noteworthy planning history and tradition. Measuring the widths of sidewalks, street pavements, squares large and small, and other community spaces would be required, as well as quiet observation of the way people use these spaces and the municipal parks. Study of the provision for bicycles (and many other aspects of what Tim Beatley describes as the “green urbanism”) would also be important, in cities which have explicitly provided for them. Students would be encouraged to “think with a pencil” and would learn to sketch and draw, in addition to acquiring supplementary computer graphic skills.

The course would include classes in state-of-the art local land-use regulations taught by tenured and non-tenured “professors of practice”, and education in the economics of development, conservation, and municipal service provision, all sadly lacking in most planning curricula today, and essential for the preparation of the next generation of planners. These elements would form the core, and individual universities would have the flexibility to supplement them as they see fit.

However, in no case would classes in esoteric subjects of limited practical value to graduates (such as input-output analysis, qualitative analysis, systems engineering, statistics, sociology, ethnic studies, anthropology, or gender studies) be required, although they should certainly be offered as electives, perhaps through other departments. In the words of Rick Bernhardt, “the elements of urban design belong in every planning program and not just where one is seeking an urban design specialty. The principles of city building and design should be the foundation of every planning education and not simply an elective add-on.”

Although past efforts by well-meaning groups to write up model syllabi and to produce curricular aids to hand to planning schools have generally not been very productive, a hopeful sign is that. ULI's Urban Plan curriculum has been used to great success at some universities, such as Georgia Tech, to teach fundamentals of real estate development, according to Ellen Dunham-Jones. Perhaps this kind of approach might work again to help restore the balance in planning school curricula, which have for the most part veered far away from physical planning and urban design over the last 50 years.

Signatories

The professionals listed below have added their names because, even though not all of them necessarily agree with every aspect of the article, they do feel that it raises very important issues that should be seriously discussed and addressed.

1. Ellen Dunham-Jones, Professor, Coordinator Master of Science in Urban Design, College of Architecture, Georgia Institute of Technology
2. Douglas Kelbaugh, FAIA, Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Michigan
3. Emily Talen, FAICP, Professor, School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning School of Sustainability, Arizona State University
4. Timothy Beatley, Teresa Heinz Professor of Sustainable Communities and Chair, Department of Urban and Environmental Planning, University of Virginia
5. Eugenie Birch, Lawrence C. Nussdorf Professor and Chair, Graduate Group, Co-Director, Penn IUR, University of Pennsylvania
6. Lawrence Vale Ford Professor of Urban Design and Planning, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA
7. Nan Ellin, Professor and Chair, Dept of City and Metropolitan Planning, College of Architecture + Planning, University of Utah
8. Jon Rodiek, Professor, Coordinator of Master of Landscape Architecture, Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

9. Jack Ahern, FASLA, Vice Provost for International Programs, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Massachusetts Amherst
10. Frederick Steiner, Dean of the School of Architecture and Henry M. Rockwell Chair in Architecture, The University of Texas at Austin
11. R. Bruce Stephenson, Professor of Environmental Studies and Director of the Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism Program at Rollins College, Winter Park, FL
12. David Hopman, ASLA , PLA, Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture Program, The University of Texas at Arlington
13. Hemalata C. Dandekar Ph.D., Professor and Head, Department of City and Regional Planning, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
14. David L. Prytherch, Associate Professor Sustainability Coordinator, Department of Geography Miami University, Oxford, OH
15. Will Green, Professor and Chair, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Rhode Island
16. Paul Wack, AICP, Professor Emeritus, City & Regional Planning Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
17. Eric Sanden, Professor of Community Planning, College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Science, University of Wisconsin-River Falls
18. Andres Duany, FAIA, Founder and Principal, Duany Plater-Zyberk Town Planners, Miami, FL
19. Rob Robinson, AIA, Chairman, Urban Design Associates. Pittsburgh, PA
20. Judith Corbett, Executive Director, Local Government Commission, Sacramento, CA
21. Elizabeth Humstone, Lecturer, Boston Architectural College
22. Lisa Wise, AICP, Lecturer, California Polytechnic Institute, and lisa wise consulting, inc, San Luis Obispo, CA
23. David Dixon, FAIA, Principal in Charge of Planning and Urban Design, Goody Clancy, Boston, MA
24. Robert Orr, FAIA, Adjunct Professor, College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture, University of Hartford, West Hartford, CT, and Principal, Robert Orr & Associates LLC, New Haven, CT
25. Todd Zimmerman, Co-Managing Director, Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Clinton, NJ
26. Daniel K. Slone, Esq. McGuireWoods LLP, Richmond, VA

27. Rick Bernhardt, FAICP, CNU-A, Executive Director, Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County Planning Department, Nashville TN
28. Peter Katz, author, The New Urbanism; founding executive director, Congress for the New Urbanism; co-founder, Form-Based Codes Institute, Arlington, VA
29. Stephanie Bothwell, ASLA, CNU, Urban and Landscape Design, Washington, DC
30. Mark Hinshaw, FAIA, FAICP, LMN Architects, Seattle, WA
31. Alan Feinberg, AICP, FeinDesign, Frederick, MD
32. Victor Dover, FAICP LEED-AP CNU-A, Dover, Kohl & Partners Town Planning, Coral Gables, FL
33. Joseph Kohl, CNU-A, Principal, Dover, Kohl & Partners Town Planning, Coral Gables, FL
34. Jeff Speck, Principal, Speck & Associates LLC, Washington, DC.
35. John Francis Torti FAIA LEED AP, BD+C, President, Torti Gallas and Partners Inc, Silver Spring, MD
36. Doug Farr, AIA, Farr Associates, Chicago, IL
37. Roger Millar, PE, AICP, CFM, Vice President, Smart Growth America and Past President, Montana Association of Planners, Billings, MT
38. Connie B. Cooper, FAICP, President, Cooper Consulting, Dallas, TX
39. Carolyn Radisch, AICP, ORW Landscape Architects and Planners, White River Junction, VT
40. Theo H.B.M. Holtwijk, Director of Long-Range Planning, Falmouth, Maine
41. Thomas E. Low, AIA CNU LEED AICP ASLA NCARB, Partner, Director of Town Planning, DPZ Architects and Town Planners and Chair, Civic By Design Center, Charlotte, NC
42. Jim Constantine, PP, Principal, Looney Ricks Kiss, Princeton, NJ
43. Donald Broussard, Principal, Town Planning & Design LLC, DeKalb County Planning Commission 2002-2006, Planning Accreditation Board member 1980-81, Atlanta GA
44. Tony Redman, AICP, Founder and Principal, Redman/Johnston Associates, LTD, Easton, MD
45. Marie L. York, FAICP, President, York Solutions LLC, Jupiter FL; Senior Fellow, Center for Building Better Communities, University of Florida.
46. Clayton W. Preston, RA, AIA ret., AICP ret., President, Village Habitat Design, LLC, Atlanta, Georgia.

47. Gonzalo Echeverria Halley-Harris, Senior Associate LRK Princeton, NJ and Lecturer at the Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ
48. Jason Beske, AICP, Principal Planner, City of Arlington, VA and past chair of APA's Urban Design and Preservation Division
49. Harry Dodson, FASLA, Principal, Dodson & Flinker, Ashfield, MA
50. William J. Johnson, FASLA, Holland, MI
51. Carlos Rodrigues, AICP, Design Solutions for a Crowded Planet, Princeton, NJ
52. J. Kris Krider, Assoc. AIA, LEED Assoc.- Benchmark CMR Inc., Planning Director, City of Kannapolis, NC
53. Karen Hundt, AICP, Director, Community Design Group, Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency, Chattanooga, TN 37402
54. Christine Dettore, Director, Monroe County Planning Commission, East Stroudsburg, PA
55. Anthony Flint, Director of Public Affairs, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, MA
56. John Fernsler AIA, Principal, Wallace Roberts Todd, Coral Gables FL
57. Dawn Blobaum, Assistant Town Manager and former Planning Director, Davidson, NC
58. Charles M. Hanlon, Principal, Land Vision, Inc., Chicago, IL
59. Kara Wilbur, CNU, Director, Town Planning & Urban Design Collaborative, Gardiner, ME.
60. Michael Welti, AICP, Director of Planning Services, Behan Planning and Design, Saratoga Springs, NY
61. Carron Day AICP, CEP, CNU-A, Project Manager, PlanIt EAST, Swansboro NC
62. Lara K. Diettrich, Principal of Diettrich Planning, LLC; Florida Planning and Zoning Association State Board of Directors and Northeast Florida Past President; and Northeast Florida Regional Representative for the Florida Redevelopment Association
63. Ted Brovitz, Manager of Community Planning and Design, Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Boston Massachusetts.
64. Craig N. Benedict, AICP, Planning and Inspections Director, Orange County Government; Hillsborough, NC
65. J. Theodore Fink, AICP, Principal, GREENPLAN Inc., Past Professor of Land Use Planning, Bard College Graduate School of Environmental Studies (now the Bard Center for Environmental Policy).

66. Robert G. McKay, AICP, Director of Planning and Development, City of Lee's Summit, Missouri
67. Buzz Constable, Land Use Attorney, Investor, Conservation Planner, Loeb Fellow, Boston MA
68. Tony Sease, RA, PE, LEED-AP, President, Civitech, Inc., Durham, NC
69. Hazel Borys, Managing Principal, PlaceMakers, LLC; Organizer of the Placemaking@Work Education Series
70. Bill Dennis RA, Principal, B. Dennis Town Design, Providence RI
71. Sandy Sorlien, CNU-A, Principal, SmartCode Local, Philadelphia, PA
72. Deana Rhodeside, Director, Rhodeside & Harwell, Alexandria, Virginia.
73. Ken Suddreth, Community Development Director, Smyrna, GA
74. Kirk Johnson AICP, Senior Planner/Team Supervisor, Envision Skagit 2060 Project Manager, Skagit County Planning & Development Services, Mount Vernon, WA
75. David W. Woods, Ph.D., AICP/PP, Principal, GreenWoods Associates, Port Jefferson, NY
76. Christopher G. Parker, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, Dover, NH
77. David A. Hoover, AICP, Owner, PlanThis, Galveston, Texas
78. Dave Waden, ASLA, Senior Planner, City of Elgin, Elgin, IL
79. Wayne Feiden, FAICP, Director of Planning and Development, City of Northampton, MA
80. Robert D. Cotter, FAICP, PP, Planning Director, Jersey City, NJ
81. W.J. "Bud" Melton III, Vice President, Bowman-Melton Associates, Inc., Dallas, Texas
82. Richard K. Magee, AICP, Deputy Director Metroplan Little Rock, AR
83. Roger Eastman, AICP, Zoning Code Administrator, Flagstaff, AZ
84. Tom Comitta, FAICP, President, Thomas Comitta Associates, West Chester, PA
85. James A. Moore, Ph.D., AIA, AICP, LEED AP BD+C, Director of International Urban Planning, Henningson Durham & Richardson International, Inc., Tampa, FL
86. Milt Rhodes, AICP, CNU, Urban Designer, New Urban Water Works, Raleigh, NC
87. Roger Hawk, President, Hawk Planning Resources LLC, Concord, NH

88. Lawrence Calderon, MAURP, Chief of Current Planning, Planning & Development Services Department, City of Gainesville, Florida
89. Milton Herd, AICP, Herd Planning & Design, Leesburg, VA
90. Tim Brennan, Executive Director, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission and Adjunct Faculty Member at University of Massachusetts Amherst and Westfield State University
91. Jack Simoneau, AICP, Planning Director, Huntersville, NC
92. Joel Russell, Esq., Principal, Joel Russell Associates, Northampton, MA
93. David Clear, Senior Management Analyst, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, City of San Antonio, TX
94. Al Zelinka, FAICP, CMSM, Community Development Director, City of Riverside, CA
95. Dallas Jasper, CSBA, Executive Director, Sustainable Building Advisor Institute, Seattle WA
96. Terry H. Martin, Ph.D., formerly Chief Planner, Cattaraugus County, Little Falls, NY
97. Miguel Angel Vazquez, AICP Healthy Communities Planner, Riverside County Department of Public Health, Riverside, CA
98. Dean L. Bennett, Director of Community and Economic Development, Hampden, Maine
99. Amelia C. Sondgeroth, AICP, Principal, Canales-Sondgeroth & Associates, Austin, TX
100. Susan Britt, AICP, Planning & Community Development Manager, City of Tega Cay, SC
101. Peter Kasabach, Executive Director, New Jersey Future, Trenton, NJ
102. Mike Hollibaugh, PLA, AICP; Director, Department of Community Services, City of Carmel, Indiana
103. Greg Kessler, Planning Director, New Berlin, WI, and Adjunct Assistant Professor in land-use planning practice, UW Madison School of Architecture and Urban Planning
104. Susan E. Caswell, AICP, Assistant to the Director, Community, Environmental, and Development Services Department, Orange County, Orlando, FL
105. Michael Behrendt, AICP, Planning Director, Durham, New Hampshire; Board member of CNU New England
106. Tim Goodfellow, AICP, Principal Planner II, Frederick County Department of Planning and Development Review, Frederick MD
107. Sharon Wason, AICP, Town Planner, Foxborough, MA

108. Edward J. Mitro, Town Manager and former Director of Planning, Zionsville, IN
109. Erin A. Degutis, RLA, ASLA, AICP, Senior Project Manager, TRC Solutions, Denver, CO
110. Jonathan J. Reiner, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, North Kingstown, RI
111. Richard G. Gertson, ICMA-CM, AICP, Community Development Director, City of Mesquite, Texas

The original Planetizen article, a condensed version of the above, which appeared on 10/31/12, can be seen at <http://www.planetizen.com/node/59072>